

Editorial

This volume 51 of JSCS is, so to speak, the second jubilee volume for the IOSCS. Like the previous volume, it contains reports on Septuagint and Septuagint Studies in different countries. There are reports on: *Greece* (Evangelia G. Dafni), *The Netherlands* (Michaël N. van der Meer), *Poland* (Krzysztof Mielcarek), *Sweden, Denmark and Norway* (Mogens Müller), *South Africa* (Gert J. Steyn), and *South America* (Rodrigo Franklin de Sousa).

Additional reports are still in preparation and will appear in the next issue: on Armenia, Australia, Georgia, Great Britain, and hopefully some others like Japan.

The papers section opens with the essay that won the Wevers Prize in 2017: Jelle Verburg, *The Septuagint of the Law of Deposit in Exodus 22:6-14*, which compares the law of deposit in the Septuagint with early Jewish traditions and especially shows the differences from (later) rabbinic regulations.

Drew Longacre, *Two Selective Greek Texts of Exodus: A Comparative Analysis of Rahlfs 896 and 960*, offers a new presentation and interpretation of these two fragmentary Exodus papyri.

Luke Gorton, *In the Court of Foreigners: Translational Strategies in the Septuagint of Exodus 7-9 and Daniel 1-6*, analyses and compares the roles of Moses and of Daniel and his friends, including the presentation of their behavior towards their opponents.

Unsung Kwak, *Joyful Story: The Building of the Second Temple in 1 Esdras 5:53-62*, shows how the (re)building of the temple is presented as a joyful story.

Guy Darshan, *The Hapax δυναστεύματα in 3 Kgdms 2:46c*, explores the meaning and the probable Hebrew background of this hapax legomenon in the context of the so-called miscellanies.

Rodrigo de Sousa, *The Righteous King in LXX Isa 32:1-4: Hope and Ideology in Translation*, analyses the aspects mentioned in the title as they are expressed in the translation.

Anne Francoise Loiseau, *Jérôme dans le sillage d'Aquila et du Targum: Vg iuxta Hebraeos Ps 42[41], 2 et Vg 1 R 22, 38*, shows that Jerome knew traditions that can also be found in the Targum and that he takes up such perspectives into his own work.

Felix Albrecht, *Beobachtungen zu den Bibelziten der „Lex Dei“ sive „Mosaicarum et Romanarum legum collatio“*, analyses the biblical quotations

in this not-so-well-known late antique legal text and its relation to older textual forms of the Septuagint and to Rabbinic traditions.

Takamitsu Muraoka, *Morphology of Compound Greek Numerals*, concentrates on the compound numerals up to 199 and analyses their rendering in the Septuagint.

Dominique Mangin, *Pour une étude conjointe de la version sahidique et du texte grec court du livre de Job*, reminds us of the still important and unsurpassed study on the Coptic-Sahidic and the short Greek text of the book of Job by Augustinus Ciasca from 1889 and translates its Latin introduction.

The book reviews section contains seven reviews on quite different yet important books on the Septuagint.

This is now the second volume of JSCS issued by Peeters publishers. To my knowledge, any problems that occurred due to the transition have now been solved. As a reminder: individuals get their copies of the Journal by becoming member of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, while institutional subscriptions are administered by Peeters directly. For details, see the information on the cover pages. In addition, don't forget to send an email with your postal address (or your address change) so that the Journal can be sent to you.

Once more, I would like to thank the authors for their articles and book reviews, and the members of the editorial board and the peer reviewers for their support.

Siegfried Kreuzer

June 2018

Septuaginta-Forschung in Griechenland vom 19. bis zum 21. Jahrhundert

EVANGELIA G. DAFNI

Die sogenannte Septuaginta, d.i. die älteste, vollständig überlieferte, griechische Übersetzung der Hebräischen Bibel samt Anaginoskomena¹, den sogenannten deuterokanonischen Schriften, war die erste Heilige Schrift der griechisch-sprechenden Urkirche. Nach der Entstehung des Neuen Testaments bildete sie den untrennbaren, gleichwertigen und autoritativen ersten Teil des kirchlichen Bibelkanons. Dieser Bibelkanon wird in der Orthodoxen Kirche nach den schon in der byzantinischen Zeit beschlossenen Richtlinien studiert, interpretiert und im privaten sowie im öffentlichen liturgischen Leben verwendet².

Das Studium des Alten Testaments in Griechenland fällt im Grunde mit dem Studium der Septuaginta³ zusammen, da sie den offiziellen alttestamentlichen Text der Orthodoxen Kirche in der Muttersprache bildet⁴. Wenn nach der Bedeutung des Alten Testaments in der Form der Septuaginta für die Orthodoxe Kirche und Theologie als wissenschaftliche Disziplin in Griechenland

¹ P.J. Bratsiotis, *Εἰσαγωγή εἰς τὴν Παλαιὰν Διαθήκην, μετὰ δύο παρατηρήσεων περὶ Ἀποκρύφων καὶ Νεωτέρων Μεταφράσεων τῆς Π.Δ.*, Athen 1936. ND 1975, 217f. 238f. 260f. 341ff. 348ff. 411ff. 499ff. Vgl. P. Boumis, *Οἱ κανόνες τῆς Ἐκκλησίας περὶ τοῦ Κανόνο τῆς Ἀγίας Γραφῆς*, Athen 1986. Ferner N.M. Papadopoulos, *Τὰ δευτεροκανονικὰ τεμάχια τοῦ βιβλίου τοῦ Δανιήλ*, Athen 1985. E. Oikonomos, „Die Bedeutung der deuterokanonischen Schriften in der Orthodoxen Kirche“, in S. Meurer (Hg.), *Die Apokryphen im Ökumenischen Horizont*, Stuttgart 1989, 26-40.

² B.M. Vellas, *Ἡ Ἀγία Γραφή ἐν τῇ Ὁρθοδόξῳ Ἐκκλησίᾳ*, Athen 1958. Ders., „Die Heilige Schrift in der griechisch-Orthodoxen Kirche“, in P.[J.] Bratsiotis (Hg.), *Die Orthodoxe Kirche in griechischer Sicht*, Teil 1, *Die Kirchen der Welt* Bd. 1, Stuttgart 1959, 121-140. D. Constantelos, „The Holy Scriptures in Greek Orthodox Worship, A Comparative and Statistical Study“, *The Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 12 (1966) 7-83.

³ Dazu gehören aber nicht die in der Ausgabe von Rahlfs enthaltenen Schriften 4 Makkabäer, Psalm 151, Psalmen Salomos und Oden.

⁴ In diesem Sinne sind zahlreiche Beiträge zu Einzelbüchern, -passagen oder -begriffen des Alten Testaments im 20. Jh. erschienen, von denen hier abgesehen wird, da sie über Griechenland hinaus keine nachhaltige Wirkung aufweisen. Dabei wird eigentlich die Septuaginta mangels Hebräisch-Kenntnisse als Hilfsmittel zum Verständnis des hebräischen Textes herangezogen.

gefragt wird, versteht es sich von selbst, dass man diese Frage mit einem Überblick über die Geschichte des Alten Testaments vom Urchristentum bis zum heutigen Tage in der griechisch-sprechenden Welt beantworten würde. Dabei würde man offensichtlich bekannte und von der gesamten Christenheit behauptete Tatsachen wiederholen⁵. Um diese Wiederholung zu vermeiden, gebrauchen wir hier das von Panagiotis J. Bratsiotis⁶ (1889-1982), dem ersten Inhaber eines Lehrstuhls für Septuaginta-Exegese an der Nationalen und Kapodistrias Universität Athen, vorgeschlagene Schema der Gliederung des alttestamentlichen bzw. Septuaginta-Gebrauchs im griechischen Kultur- und Sprachraum in vier Epochen: a) von der Entstehung der Septuaginta im ptolemäischen Alexandria unter den Nachfolgern Alexanders des Großen bis zum Ausbau des antiken Byzanz zur Residenz des römischen Imperiums von Konstantin dem Großen (330), das dann den Namen Konstantinopel erhielt; b) von der byzantinischen Zeit bis zur Eroberung von Konstantinopel durch die Osmanen (330-1453); c) vom Fall Konstantinopels bis zur Anerkennung der Unabhängigkeit des neuhellenischen Staates (1453-1830); und d) von der Gründung des neuhellenischen Staates bis zum heutigen Tage.

Alle griechischen bzw. griechisch-sprachigen Kirchenväter und Kirchenschriftsteller, die alttestamentliche Kommentare verfasst haben, stützen sich auf die Septuaginta. Derartige Kommentare gehören zum Zuständigkeitsbereich der Patristik und der neueren Kirchenliteratur und somit zur Grundausbildung der Theologen an griechischen Hochschulen und Universitäten. Die Bibelwissenschaft folgt aber ihrem eigenen Weg, abgesehen davon, ob ihre Vorläufer ein universales Wissen über alle theologischen Fächer nachweislich verfügten und sich auch an anderen Bereichen der Theologie als Wissenschaft Verdienste erworben haben.

Uns beschäftigt hier die Zeit von der Gründung des neuhellenischen Staates und der Universität in Athen 1837 durch Otto, dem ersten König der Hellenen nach der Befreiung Griechenlands von der osmanischen Herrschaft, bis zum heutigen Tage. Dabei ist die Vernachlässigung der Erforschung des Alten Testaments bzw. der Septuaginta nicht zu übersehen. Dies hängt damit zusammen, dass sich nur wenige Theologen auf das Forschungsgebiet konzentrierten und nur die wenigsten sich im Bereich der Septuaginta spezialisierten und vom neuhellenischen Staat in angemessener Weise verwendet wurden. Obwohl die

⁵ N.P. Bratsiotis, „Das Alte Testament in der Griechisch-Orthodoxen Kirche“, *Kyrios*, NF 2 (1960/61) 59-82. P.J. Bratsiotis, *Ἡ Παλαιὰ Διαθήκη ἐν τῇ Ἑλληνικῇ Ὁρθόδοξῳ Ἐκκλησίᾳ*, Athen 1961. N.P. Vasileiades, *Ἡ Παλαιὰ Διαθήκη στὴν Ὁρθόδοξον Ἐκκλησίαν*, Athen 2003².

⁶ P.J. Bratsiotis, *Ἡ Παλαιὰ Διαθήκη ἐν τῇ Ἑλληνικῇ Ἐκκλησίᾳ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἀλώσεως μέχρι Σήμερον*, Athen 1940. Vgl. L. Diestel, *Geschichte des Alten Testaments in der christlichen Kirche*, Jena 1869. A. Rahlfs, *Die alttestamentlichen Lektionen der Griechischen Kirche*, Nachrichten der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Philologisch-historische Klasse; 1915, MSU 1/5, Berlin 1915.

Interpretation des Alten Testaments an den beiden Theologischen Fakultäten der Universitäten Athen und Thessaloniki und zuletzt auch in den vier neugegründeten Kirchlichen Akademien in Athen, Thessaloniki, Velläs bei Ioannina und Herakleion immer aufgrund der Septuaginta geführt wurde, blieben und bleiben die Lehrstühle für Altes Testament bzw. Septuaginta sowohl im 19. als auch im 20. und 21. Jh. oft lange unbesetzt oder sie wurden u.U. von nicht entsprechend qualifizierten Kandidaten eingenommen. Andererseits ist der Versuch, die originäre Septuaginta-Forschung durch Übersetzungsprojekte zu ersetzen, nicht gelungen, da Bibelübersetzungen im ekklesiastischen Gewissen des hellenischen Volkes nicht die gleiche Bedeutung und Wichtigkeit wie in der westlichen Welt haben. Sie stellen mitunter sogar Widersprüche dar, denn meistens sind Zweckmäßigkeit und Prinzipien der Übersetzung bzw. der Übertragung von einer in eine andere Form der griechischen Sprache nicht klargestellt und fördern nicht die im Vokabular und in der Syntax unwiderlegbar bezeugte, ungebrochene historische Kontinuität und Einheitlichkeit der griechischen Sprache von ihren Uranfängen bis zur heutigen Zeit. Durch Vereinfachung der Sprache trägt man nicht zum besseren Verständnis des Sinnes des biblischen Textes bei. Daher geraten Übersetzungen schnell in Misskredit.

1821 bis 1928

Schon im ersten Jahr des hellenischen Aufstandes (1821) wurde die Septuaginta auf Basis der Ausgabe von Ernestus Grabe (Codex A), gefördert von den Brüdern Zosimas zugunsten des hellenischen Volkes, in Moskow gedruckt. Aber die Septuaginta-Forschung fängt erst mit Konstantinos Oikonomos ex Oikonomon (1780-1857) an⁷, dem größten universal gebildeten Theologen und einem der bedeutendsten Schriftsteller im neuzeitlichen Griechenland. Nach seiner Wiederkehr aus Russland 1834 spielte er eine zentrale Rolle in der Erlangung der Autokephalie der Kirche in Griechenland mit Erhaltung der geistlichen Vorrechte des Ökumenischen Patriarchats, aufgrund der Apostolischen Tradition und der Heiligen Kanones des ungeteilten Christentums. Neben seiner reichen Hinterlassenschaft auf den Gebieten der Exegese, Hermeneutik, Kirchengeschichte, Pastoraltheologie, sowie der griechischen Sprache und Rhetorik hatte er nachhaltigen Einfluss auf die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft und insbesondere auf die Septuaginta-Forschung mit seinem vierbändigen Werk „*Über die Septuaginta-Interpreten der Alten Heiligen Schrift*“ (1844-1849). Dieses bisher in der griechisch-sprachigen Septuaginta-Forschung analogielos gebliebene Werk wird vom Zentrum für Septuaginta-Stu-

⁷ E.G. Dafni, „Konstantinos Oikonomos ex Oikonomon als Septuaginta-Interpret“, in: A. Lemaire (Hg.), *Congress Volume Ljubljana 2007*, VTS 133, Leiden/Boston 2010, 263-292.

dien, Etaireia ton Filon tou Laou, Athen, neu herausgegeben. In seinem Mittelpunkt steht das Verständnis der göttlichen Inspiration (θεοπνευστία) der Septuaginta und seine praktische Umsetzung in die Realität der griechisch-sprechenden Kirche im 19. Jh., die von unbegründeten Ansprüchen auf kirchliche Durchsetzung vulgärer Bibelübersetzungen im Rahmen von fremden Missionierungstätigkeiten geplagt wurde. Da er es für einen besonderen Segen hielt, dass die in der ganzen Orthodoxie als göttlich inspiriert und kanonisch geltende Schrift, nämlich die Septuaginta und das Neue Testament als gleichwertige Quellen des christlichen Glaubens, in Griechisch überliefert worden sind, stellte er sich entschieden gegen jede Übersetzung der Heiligen Schrift in das Vulgärgriechische zum kirchlichen Gebrauch.

Oikonomos setzte sich hauptsächlich mit dem vierbändigen Werk von Humphrey Hody (1659-1707) auseinander: „*De Bibliorum textibus originalibus, versionibus Graecis et Latina Vulgata Libri IV, Oxonii 1705*“, der sowohl die Echtheit des Aristeebriefes als auch den göttlichen Charakter und die Geltung der Septuaginta infrage stellte und die Aufmerksamkeit auf den hebräischen Urtext lenkte. Oikonomos nahm sich, in einem ebenfalls vierbändigen Werk, die Widerlegung der Theorien von Hody vor. Die göttliche Inspiration der Septuaginta „*dem Wort und dem Sinn nach*“ begründete er durch ihre Wirkungsgeschichte. Denn sie wurde a) von den göttlich inspirierten Verfassern des Neuen Testaments aufgenommen und b) von der ungeteilten Kirche des 1. Jt.s als gleichwertige Schriftquelle zum Nachweis des Dogmas angesehen. Diese Begründung führte zu Streitgesprächen zwischen Exegeten und Dogmatikern in Griechenland, die mit einer Veröffentlichung seines Schülers, Alexandros Lykourgos (1827-1875), in Hieromnemon 1859 begannen. Sie erfuhren ihren Höhepunkt mit der intensiven theologischen Auseinandersetzung zwischen Evangelos Antoniades⁸ (1882-1962) und Panagiotis N. Trembelas⁹ (1886-1977) und sind erst mit den Beiträgen von Panagiotis J. Bratsiotis und Basileios M. Vellas¹⁰ (1900 oder 1902-1969) im Anschluss an Trembelas in den 50er Jahren des 20. Jh.s zum Stillstand gekommen, ohne endgültig abgeschlossen zu werden¹¹. Dafür wäre nach dem Selbstverständnis der Orthodoxen Kirche der Beschluss eines Ökumenischen Konzils erforderlich. Diese theologischen Auseinandersetzungen kreisten vornehmlich um das Verhältnis von Offenbarung, göttlicher Inspiration und Kanonizität der Schrift, wobei die konkrete Frage nach der göttlichen Inspiration der Septuaginta nur am Rande kommentiert wurde.

⁸ E. Antoniades, *Ἐπὶ τοῦ προβλήματος τῆς θεοπνευστίας τῆς Ἁγίας Γραφῆς*, Athen 1937.

⁹ P.N. Trembelas, *Ἡ θεοπνευστία τῆς Ἁγίας Γραφῆς*, Athen 1938.

¹⁰ B.M. Vellas, *Ἡ Ἀύθεντία τῆς Βίβλου κατὰ τὴν διδασκαλίαν τῆς Ἀνατολικῆς Ὁρθοδόξου Ἐκκλησίας*, Athen 1951.

¹¹ Dafni, „Konstantinos Oikonomos“, 291f. mit Anm. 13-20.

1928 bis 1965

1928 erlangte Panagiotis J. Bratsiotis, der spätere Mitbegründer und Mitherausgeber der führenden internationalen Zeitschrift „*Novum Testamentum*“, den neugegründeten Lehrstuhl für Einleitung in das Alte Testament und Interpretation des Alten Testaments aus der Septuaginta an der Theologischen Fakultät der Universität Athen. Sowohl mit seiner Einleitung in das Alte Testament¹² und seinen Kommentaren zu Jesaja¹³, Psalmen¹⁴ und Kohelet¹⁵ als auch mit einer Reihe von Kleinschriften zur Geschichte und Methodik der Septuaginta-Forschung, zu Septuaginta-Wortschatz, -Grammatik und -Syntax, sowie zum Verhältnis des Paulus zur Septuaginta¹⁶ legte er den Grundstein für die Septuaginta-Forschung und für die systematische Lehre der Septuaginta als eine Hochschuldisziplin in Griechenland.

Zur brennenden Frage nach der göttlichen Inspiration und des Kanons der Septuaginta betonte P.J. Bratsiotis, dass¹⁷ die „Göttlichkeit“ der Schrift etwas Anderes als die „Kanonizität“ ist. Denn die „Kanonizität“ setzt die „Göttlichkeit“ voraus und bildet das alleinige Kriterium für die Aufnahme eines Buches in den alttestamentlichen Kanon im Unterschied zu anderen profanen bzw. außerkanonischen Schriften. Damit stellte er klar, dass die Heiligkeit einer Schrift die göttliche Inspiration voraussetzt; die göttliche Inspiration wiederum die übernatürliche Offenbarung göttlicher Wahrheiten¹⁸.

P.J. Bratsiotis hat 1935 die Septuaginta in einem Band neu herausgegeben¹⁹. Als Basis diente die Edition von Rahlfs. Herausgenommen wurden biblische Passagen, die im liturgischen Leben der Orthodoxen Kirche vorgelesen bzw. gesungen werden. Diese Passagen wurden aufgrund von Manuskripten und gedruckten Ausgaben der liturgischen Bücher (Triodion, Pentikostarion, Minaia,

¹² P.J. Bratsiotis, *Εἰσαγωγή εἰς τὴν Παλαιὰν Διαθήκην*. Ders., *Ἐπίτομος Εἰσαγωγή εἰς τὴν Παλαιὰν Διαθήκην*, Athen 1955.

¹³ P.J. Bratsiotis, *Ὁ Προφήτης Ἡσαΐας*. Τεύχος Α', κεφ. α'-ιβ', Athen 1956.

¹⁴ P.J. Bratsiotis, *Αἱ Ψαλμοὶ τῶν Ἀναβαθμῶν τοῦ Ψαλτηρίου. Εἰσαγωγή καὶ ἐρμηνεία μετὰ παραφράσεως*, Athen 1928. 1956².

¹⁵ P.J. Bratsiotis, *Ὁ Ἐκκλησιαστής. Εἰσαγωγή. Κείμενον Ὁ' - Μετάφρασις ἐκ τοῦ ἐβραϊκοῦ - Σχόλια*, Athen 1951.

¹⁶ P.J. Bratsiotis, „Ὁ Ἀπόστολος Παῦλος καὶ ἡ Μετάφρασις τῶν Ὁ“, *Θεολογία* 3 (1925), 189-216. Ders., „Ἑβδομηκοντολογικὰ Μελετήματα, Τεύχος α': Αἱ περὶ τοὺς Ὁ σπουδαὶ διὰ μέσου τῶν αἰώνων“, *Θεολογία* 4 (1926), 227-246; „Τεύχος β': Ἡ Γλῶσσα τῆς Μεταφράσεως τῶν Ὁ“, *Θεολογία* 5 (1927) 56-75. 319-342. Ders., „Genesis 1,26 in der Orthodoxen Theologie“, *EvTh* 15 (1951).

¹⁷ P.J. Bratsiotis, „Εἰσαγωγή εἰς τὴν Παλαιὰν Διαθήκην“, 486-488.

¹⁸ Dafni, „Konstantinos Oikonomos“, 292.

¹⁹ P.J. Bratsiotis, „Ἡ Παλαιὰ Διαθήκη ἐν τῇ Ἑλληνικῇ Ὁρθοδόξῃ Ἐκκλησίᾳ“, 16.

Psalterion) ersetzt. Die Ausgabe der Septuaginta von P.J. Bratsiotis wird sowohl von der orthodox-christlichen Bruderschaft „Zoe“ als auch von der Apostolischen Diakonie der Kirche in Griechenland bis heute nachgedruckt. Erwähnenswert ist, dass auch Athanasios Hastoupis (1921-1993), der erste Inhaber des Lehrstuhls für Einleitung in das Alte Testament und Interpretation aus dem masoretischen Text und der Septuaginta an der Aristoteles Universität Thessaloniki, späterer Inhaber des Lehrstuhls für Hebräisch, Interpretation des Alten Testaments aus dem masoretischen Text und der biblischen Archäologie an der Nationalen und Kapodistrias Universität Athen, eine synoptische Ausgabe der Septuaginta und der Übersetzung des korrigierten hebräischen Textes ins Griechische – mit Heranziehung von diversen englischen Übersetzungen – in zwei Bänden (1954-1955) betreute. Diese Ausgabe wurde dann mehrmals in drei Bänden neugedruckt und für universitäre Zwecke benutzt.

Mitte des 20. Jh.s werden zwei Kommentarreihen zur gesamten Septuaginta von Panagiotis N. Trembelas²⁰, der seine dreibändige „*Dogmatik der Orthodoxen Östlichen Kirche*“²¹ auf seiner Auslegung der Septuaginta und des Neuen Testaments stützte, und Joel Jannakopoulos²² (1901-1966) veröffentlicht, die von der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Athen ausgezeichnet wurden und nachhaltigen Einfluss auf das kirchliche ekklesiastische Gewissen des hellenischen Volkes haben. Die betreffenden Kommentare bieten Paraphrasen des Septuaginta-Textes, Scholien aus patristischen Kommentaren und Katenen zu Einzelversen von historisch-philologischer Relevanz und hoher theologischen Tragweite. Wie ihre Verfasser aber schon in den Prologen oder den Einleitungen ihrer Werke klarstellen, sind sie nicht primär wissenschaftlich orientiert, sondern wollen das kerygmatische Werk der Orthodoxen Kirche zur Erbauung ihrer Mitglieder zu unterstützen. Dem entspricht ihr Ansatz an das jeweilige Septuaginta-Buch sowie auch der Sprachstil und die Formulierung der Einzelargumente, ohne freilich theologisch- und philologisch-relevante Beobachtungen von wissenschaftlichem Interesse vorzuenthalten. Nach dem Vorbild der soeben genannten Kommentarreihen, die heute nachgedruckt und auch im akademischen Unterricht gebraucht werden, wurde 1971-1973 die

²⁰ Siehe v.a. die mehrmals von der orthodox-christlichen Bruderschaft „Soter“ nachgedruckten Werke von P.N. Trembelas, *Ἡ Παλαιὰ Διαθήκη μετὰ συντόμον ἐρμηνείας*, Bd. 4; 8; 10; 11; 13-16, Athen 1962ff. Ders., *Τὸ Ψαλτήριον*, Athen 1955. Ders., *Ὑπόμνημα εἰς τὴν Ρούθ*, Athen 1961. Ders., *Ὁ Προφήτης Ἰωνάς. Κείμενον, σύντομος ἐρμηνεία, σχόλια καὶ πρακτικαὶ παρατηρήσεις*, Athen 1962. Ders., *Ὑπόμνημα εἰς τὸν Ἰώβ*, Athen 1965. Ders., *Ὑπόμνημα εἰς τὸν Προφήτην Ἡσαΐαν*, Athen 1968.

²¹ P.N. Trembelas, *Δογματικὴ τῆς Ὁρθοδόξου Καθολικῆς Ἐκκλησίας*, Bd. 1-3, Athen 1959-1961 mehrmals von der orthodox-christlichen Bruderschaft „Soter“ nachgedruckt.

²² J. Jannakopoulos, *Ἡ Παλαιὰ Διαθήκη κατὰ τοὺς Ο΄. Κείμενον - Ἑρμηνευτικὴ παράφρασις - Σχόλια*, Bd. 1-26, Kalamai 1955-1964, in Athen (Rigopoulos) und Thessaloniki (orthodox-christliche Schwesternschaft „Lydia“) mehrmals nachgedruckt.

Septuaginta in fünf Bänden mit kurzen hermeneutischen Anmerkungen von Johannes Th. Kolitsaras (1903-1989) unter der Ägide der orthodox-christlichen Bruderschaft „Zoe“ veröffentlicht²³.

1965 bis 1998

Am 23. August 1965 hat Nikolaos P. Bratsiotis (1932-) beim 5. IOSOT-Kongress in Genf einen Hauptvortrag zum Thema „נִפְשׁ - ΨΥΧΗ“ gehalten, der 1966 in „*Supplements to Vetus Testamentum*“ mit dem Untertitel „*Ein Beitrag zur Erforschung der Sprache und Theologie der Septuaginta*“ publiziert wurde²⁴. Dieser Beitrag ist nicht nur aus lexikographischer²⁵, psychologischer und theologischer Sicht von größter Wichtigkeit, sondern macht auch die Korrektur der üblichen Auffassung, dass die Septuaginta-Wiedergabe von נִפְשׁ durch ΨΥΧΗ das Tor zum platonischen Einfluss auf das Alte Testament geöffnet habe, möglich und sogar nötig. Dies hatte wichtige Konsequenzen für die Anthropologie der hebräischen und der griechischen Bibel.

Mit dem betreffenden Beitrag wurde der Begriff „Theologie der Septuaginta“ eingebürgert. Anders als Joseph Ziegler²⁶ („Theologie der Griechischen und Lateinischen Bibel“), Leo Priejs²⁷ („Jüdische Tradition in der Septuaginta“) und Isaak Leo Seligmann²⁸ („Die Übersetzung als Dokument der jüdisch-alexandrinischen Theologie“) sprach Nikolaos P. Bratsiotis von der „Sprache und Theologie der Septuaginta“ (1966) und trug somit entscheidend zum Verständnis des sprachlichen und konzeptionellen Horizontes der Septuaginta bei. Aufgrund einer großen Fülle von relevantem, vorplatonischen Material versuchte er, die Animosität der internationalen alttestamentlichen Gelehrsamkeit seiner Zeit gegen die Septuaginta zu verändern und deren Vorurteile zu widerlegen, dass der Septuaginta-Text platonische Ideen aufweise, die

²³ J.Th. Kolitsaras, *Η Παλαιά Διαθήκη. Κείμενον, Ερμηνευτική Απόδοσις*, Bd. 1-5, Athen 1971-1973 (mehrmals nachgedruckt).

²⁴ N.P. Bratsiotis, „נִפְשׁ - ΨΥΧΗ. Ein Beitrag zur Erforschung der Sprache und der Theologie der Septuaginta“, VTS XV (1966), 58-89.

²⁵ Später hat sich auch P. Simotas zu einzelnen sprachlichen Phänomenen der Septuaginta geäußert: Siehe *Τὸ ἑβραϊκὸν δεῦρον ἐν τῇ μεταφράσει τῶν Ο΄*, Ἀθήναι 1964. Ders., *Τὸ χωρίον Β΄ Βασιλειῶν 24,15 κατὰ τὸ κείμενον τῶν Ο΄*, Athen 1966. Ders., *Αἱ ἀμετάφραστοι λέξεις ἐν τῷ κειμένῳ τῶν Ο΄*, Thessaloniki 1969. Vgl. ders., *Ερμηνευτικὴ ἔρευνα εἰς τὸ κείμενον τῆς Παλαιᾶς Διαθήκης ἐπὶ τῇ βάσει ἀρχαίων ἐλληνικῶν μεταφράσεων*, Athen 1999.

²⁶ J. Ziegler, *Dulcedo Dei. Ein Beitrag zur Theologie der Griechischen und Lateinischen Bibel*, ATA XIII/2, München 1937.

²⁷ L. Priejs, *Jüdische Tradition in der Septuaginta*, Leiden 1948 (Diss), Hildesheim 1987.

²⁸ I.L. Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah. A Discussion of its Problems, IV. The Translation as a Document of Jewish-Alexandrian Theology*, Leiden 1948, 95ff.

den ursprünglichen Gehalt der Offenbarung in der Hebräischen Bibel verwässerten. Er zeigte, dass das Septuaginta-Standardäquivalent ΨΥXH für נפש die ältesten Volksbedeutungen der griechisch-sprachigen Welt vor Augen hatte und nicht deren spätere platonische philosophische Systematisierung. Denn die Welt von Homer, Hesiod, Pindar, Herodot und den Tragikern war im Osten nach den Eroberungen von Alexander dem Großen durch die griechische Sprache und die Grundbildung der hellenistischen Welt weiter bekannt. Erinnert sei daran, dass der prominente Schweizer Theologe Emil Brunner sein Werk „*Der Mensch in Widerspruch*“ (1937)²⁹ mit der Annahme eröffnete, dass es im Alten Testament keinen Begriff der Seele gibt, wie dieser vom griechischen zum europäischen Denken übergegangen ist. Zu einer Zeit, in der keine elektronischen Werkzeuge wie TLG oder Bibleworks o.ä. zur Verfügung standen, studierte N.P. Bratsiotis alle vorhandene altgriechische Literatur und nicht nur die platonisch-philosophischen Schriften und zeigte aufgrund von unzähligen Beispielen, dass schon von Homer bis zu den Tragikern und Aristophanes die Beziehung zwischen Seele und Blut als Ort der Seele literarisch bezeugt ist³⁰. In weiterer Folge verlegte N.P. Bratsiotis den Schwerpunkt seiner Septuaginta-Forschung mehr und mehr auf die Anthropologie und ihr Verhältnis zum altgriechischen Schrifttum.

N.P. Bratsiotis verfasste das erste Werk mit dem Titel „*Anthropologie des Alten Testaments*“ (1964-1967)³¹. Dabei handelt es sich um eine vorbildlich detaillierte und akribische Untersuchung (a) der beiden Berichte von der Erschaffung des Menschen in Gen 1-2 nach dem masoretischen Text und der Septuaginta als anthropologischen Grundquellen des Alten Testaments³² und (b) aller hebräischer Wörter und Redewendungen samt ihrer Septuaginta-Wiedergaben, die von anthropologischer Wichtigkeit und Tragweite sind, wie z.B. בשר – σάρξ/σῶμα, נפש – ψυχή, נשמה – πνοή, רוח – πνεῦμα, im Hinblick auf (a) den Ursprung und die Natur des Menschen, (b) die Bestandteile des Menschen, (c) die geistigen Kräfte und Energien im Menschen, (d) den Menschen als psychosomatische Einheit und (e) seine Entstehung und Bestimmung.

²⁹ E. Brunner, *Der Mensch im Widerspruch. Die christliche Lehre vom wahren und wirklichen Menschen*, Berlin 1937.

³⁰ Aristophanes, Nubes 712 (καὶ τὴν ψυχὴν ἐκπίνουσιν anstatt von αἷμα ἐκπίνουσιν) in N.P. Bratsiotis, נפש - ΨΥXH, 65, Anm. 9.

³¹ N.P. Bratsiotis, *Ἀνθρωπολογία τῆς Παλαιᾶς Διαθήκης. I. Ὁ ἄνθρωπος ὡς θεῖον δημιούργημα*, Athen 1967 (mehrmals nachgedruckt). Vgl. z.B. die Rezension dazu von H. Junker in *Trierer Theologische Zeitschrift* 77 (1968) 129f.

³² Vgl. N.P. Bratsiotis, „Bemerkungen zur Erschaffung des Menschen nach Gen. 2“, in L. Hein (Hg.), *Die Einheit der Kirche. Dimensionen ihrer Heiligkeit, Katholizität und Apostolizität*, Festgabe P. Meinhold zum 70. Geburtstag, Wiesbaden 1977, 390-403.

Von den 60er Jahren des vergangenen Jh.s bis zu seiner Emeritierung 1999 hat N.P. Bratsiotis Lehrveranstaltungen zur Theologie der Septuaginta an der Nationalen und Kapodistrias Universität von Athen ununterbrochen angeboten. Individuelle Entscheidungen innerhalb der soziokulturellen und universitätspolitischen Umwälzungen der 70er und 80er Jahre haben das Gedeihen der akademischen Theologie im allgemeinen und der Septuaginta-Forschung wenig gefördert. Aber am Anfang der 90er Jahre wurden postgraduierte Studiengänge an der Universität Athen eingeführt. Dies ermöglichte die methodische Einführung und Vertiefung auf postgraduierter Ebene in die Theologie der Septuaginta im Vergleich mit dem altgriechischen Schrifttum³³. Daraus ist 1998 die erste Doktorarbeit auf dem Spezialgebiet der Septuaginta in Griechenland entstanden³⁴.

1998 bis heute

2001 wurde von der Etaireia ton Filon tou Laou (<http://www.etfil.com/>) zur Förderung der Erforschung der Sprache und Theologie der Septuaginta ein Zentrum für Septuaginta Studien eingerichtet. Dieses Zentrum nimmt u.a. auch die neue Edition des vierbändigen Werkes von Konstantinos Oikonomos ex Oikonomon „Über die Septuaginta-Interpreten der Alten Heiligen Schrift“ (1844-1849) vor.

Unter „Theologie der Septuaginta“³⁵ bzw. „Theologie der Sprache der Septuaginta“³⁶ kann man zweierlei verstehen: a) die Theologie, die aus der Septuaginta durch philologische und theologische Analyse ihrer Sprache und die Erklärung ihrer spezifischen theologischen Denkweise herausgeht und auf

³³ N.P. Bratsiotis, „Η Παλαιά Διαθήκη ως Αγία Γραφή. Ολίγα καί περί τῆς σχέσεώς της πρὸς τὴν Ὁρθοδόξιαν καὶ τὸν Ἑλληνισμόν“, Athen 2012², 38-42.

³⁴ E.G. Dafni, שְׁמֹנֶה – ΟΦΙΣ. Γενέσεως 3 καὶ Ἡσαΐου 27,1 ὑπὸ τὸ φῶς καὶ τῶν Α΄ Βασιλ. 22,19-23, Γ΄ β 1,6-12. 2,1-7 καὶ Ζαχ. 3,1-2. Συμβολὴ εἰς τὴν ἔρευναν τῆς γλώσσης καὶ τῆς θεολογίας τῆς Παλαιᾶς Διαθήκης ἐξ ἐπόμεως Μασσωριτικοῦ κειμένου καὶ Μεταφράσεως τῶν Ο΄, Athen 1998 / Göttingen 2000 (Rezension von A. Schart, ZAW 113 [2001] 462-463). Dies., „Genesis 3 und Jesaja 27,1,, BIOSCS 35 (2002) 47-54.

³⁵ N.P. Bratsiotis, Εἰσαγωγή εἰς τὴν Θεολογίαν τῆς Παλαιᾶς Διαθήκης, Ἀθῆναι 1967, 53-58 (mehrmals nachgedruckt). Ders., Ὁ Μονοθεϊσμός τῆς Παλαιᾶς Διαθήκης. Συμβολὴ εἰς τὴν Θεολογίαν τῆς Παλαιᾶς Διαθήκης, Athen 2013. Ders., Ἐξ Ἀποκαλύψεως γινώσκεις Θεοῦ - σχέσις Θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπου - πίστις καὶ ἀθεΐα. Συμβολὴ εἰς τὴν Θεολογίαν τῆς Παλαιᾶς Διαθήκης, Athen 2015.

³⁶ E.G. Dafni, „אֱרֹחַ הַקֹּדֶשׁ – ἄνθρωπος ὁ πνευματοφόρος (Hos 9,7). Zur Theologie der Sprache des Hoseabuches, in R.Sollamo/S. Sipilä (Hg.), Helsinki Perspectives on the Translation Technique of the Septuagint, Publications of the Finnish Exegetical Society 82, Helsinki/Göttingen 2001, 248-267, hier 266f. Vgl. dies., Παραλείπομενα τῆς συζητήσεως περὶ τὴν Θεολογίαν τῆς Μεταφράσεως τῶν Ο΄, Vetus Testamentum et Hellas 2 (2015), 83-152.

die ursprüngliche Übersetzungstätigkeit zurückgreifen und gründen will³⁷; b) die Theologie, die man in der Septuaginta gesehen hat. Diese Betrachtungsweise nutzt die Wirkungs- und Rezeptionsgeschichte der Septuaginta im Judentum und Christentum und baut darauf auf. Dabei würde man zunächst die Werke der griechischen bzw. griechisch-sprachigen Kirchenväter und die Lehrsätze der sieben Ökumenischen Konzilien, sowie die liturgische bzw. hymnographische und ikonographische Sprache der Orthodoxen Kirche, die von der Sprache der Septuaginta und den damit verbundenen theologischen Gedanken völlig durchdrungen ist, mitberücksichtigen³⁸.

Das Reden von einer „*Theologie der Sprache der Septuaginta*“³⁹ soll auch zur Entwicklung einer Methodik dienen, mit der die theologische Sprache der Septuaginta unter besonderer Berücksichtigung des altgriechischen Schrifttums und Denkens untersucht werden kann⁴⁰.

³⁷ E.G. Dafni, *Von Angesicht zu Angesicht. Prolegomena zum Thema "Gott schauen" im hebräischen und griechischen Exodusbuch, 1. Exodus 33,11.12-23 übersetzungs- und wirkungs-kritisch*, Ἐπιστημονικαὶ Μελέται 2, Athen 2001. Dies., *Ἡ Ἀποκάλυψις Ἡσαΐου κατὰ τὴν Μετάφρασιν τῶν Ο΄*, Thessaloniki 2013. Dies., „Jesaja-Apokalypse“, in <https://www.bibelwissenschaft.de/stichwort>. Dies., „Ἀγνωσία καὶ Γνώσις Θεοῦ. Συμβολὴ εἰς τὴν ἔρευναν τῆς γλώσσης καὶ τῆς θεολογίας τῆς Σοφίας Σολομῶντος ἐπὶ τῇ βάσει τοῦ β΄ θεολογικοῦ παραρτήματος (ΣοφΣολ. 13-15)“, *Παλαιὰ Διαθήκη – Μετάφρασις τῶν Ἑβδομήκοντα / Vetus Testamentum – Septuaginta* 1, Thessaloniki 2018.

³⁸ N.P. Bratsiotis, *Ἡ Παλαιὰ Διαθήκη ὡς Ἁγία Γραφή*, 43.

³⁹ Näheres dazu E.G. Dafni, „Theologie der Sprache der Septuaginta“. ThZ 58 (2002), 315-328 (Einführungsvortrag beim IOSCS-Kongress in Basel 2000). Dies., „Theologie der Sprache der Septuaginta im Horizont des Altgriechischen Schrifttums und Denkens“, *Journal for Semitics* 18.2 (2009) 434-457 (<https://repository.up.ac.za/handle/2263/13789>).

⁴⁰ Dazu siehe E.G. Dafni, *Genesis, Plato und Euripides. Drei Studien zum Austausch von Griechischem und Hebräischem Sprach- und Gedankengut in der Klassik und im Hellenismus*, BThS 108, Neukirchen-Vluyn 2010. „שָׂרָא – γυνή ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς αὐτῆς (Gen 2,23). Zur Anthropologie von Genesis 1-11“, in: A. Wenin (Hg.), *Studies in the Book of Genesis. Literature, Redaction and History*. Papers presented at the 48th Colloquium Biblicum Lovaniense (28., 29. and 30. July 1999), BETL 155, Leuven 2001, 569-584. Ferner siehe dies., „שָׂרָא und die falsche Prophetie in IReg 22“, ZAW 112 (2000), 365-385. Dies., „Οἱ οὐκ ὄντες θεοὶ in der Septuaginta des Jeremiabuches und in der Epistel Jeremias. Ein Beitrag zur Erforschung des Werdegangs des sogenannten alexandrinischen Kanons“, in: J.-M. Auwers/H.J. de Jonge (Hg.), *The Biblical Canons*, BETL 163, Leuven 2003, 235-245. Dies., „ΝΟΥΣ in der Septuaginta des Hiobbuches. Zur Frage nach der Rezeption der Homerepik im Hellenistischen Judentum“, JSJ XXXVII (2006) 34-54. Dies., „Σπλάγχχνα im Altgriechischen Schrifttum und in der Septuaginta. Zur Anthropologie der Septuaginta“, in: M. Augustin/H.M. Niemann (Hg.), *Stimulation from Leiden. Collected Communications to the XVIIIth Congress of the International Organization for the Study of the Old Testament*, Leiden 2004, BEATAJ 54, Frankfurt a.M. u.a. 2006, 285-294. Dies., „Παντοκράτωρ in Septuaginta-Amos 4,13. Zur Theologie der Sprache der Septuaginta“, in: M. Knibb (Hg.), *The Septuagint and Messianism*, Colloquium Biblicum Lovaniense LIII, July 27-19, 2004, BETL 195, Leuven 2006, 443-454. Dies., „Die sogenannten ‘Ebed-Jahwe-Lieder in der

Den aktuellen akademischen Herausforderungen für Internationalisierung und wissenschaftliche Exzellenz entsprechend organisiert man am Fachbereich für Pastoral- und Sozialtheologie der Theologischen Fakultät der Aristoteles Universität Thessaloniki seit 2014 die erste und bisher einzige internationale Jahreskonferenz zur Theologie der Septuaginta (<http://www.past.auth.gr/el/conferences>).

Septuaginta", M.K.H. Peeters (Hg.), *XII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies*, Leiden 2004, SBL.SCS, Atlanta, Ga 2006, 187-200. Dies., "Psalm 150 according to the Septuagint. Integrating Translation- and Tradition-Criticism into the modern Septuagint Exegesis", *Verbum et Ecclesia* 27 (2006) 431-454. Dies., "Βπορός. A favourite word of Homer in the Septuagint version of Job", *Verbum et Ecclesia* 28 (2007) 35-65. Dies., "Genesis and Euripides: Exchange in Virtue Ethics between Israel and Hellas in the Classical and Hellenistic Period", *Old Testament Essays* 20 (2007), 601-615. Dies., „Euripides und das Alte Testament. Zum Überlieferungsgeschichtlichen Horizont der Septuaginta“, M.H. Peeters, *XIII Congress of the IOSCS: Ljubljana, 2007*, SBL.SCS, Atlanta Ga. 2008, 85-95. Dies., „Septuaginta und Plato in Justins 'Dialog mit Tryphon'“, *Neotestamentica* 43 (2009), 449-465. Dies., „Griechisches Spracherbe im hermeneutischen Horizont der Septuaginta: Ein Diamant inmitten meines Volkes Israel (LXX-Am 7,7f.)“, *Journal for Semitics* 18 (2009) 500-550. Dies., "Ὁσιος und ὁσιότης in der LXX und Platos Euthyphron. Lexikographische, geistes- und kulturgeschichtliche Überlegungen“, in G. Bonney/R. Vicent (Hg.), *Sophia – Paideia. Sapienza e Educazione (Sir 1,27), Miscellanea di studi offerti in onore del prof. Don Mario Cimosà*, Nuova Biblioteca di Scienze Religiose 34, Roma 2012, 55-87. Dies., „Jerusalem als Metropole in der Septuaginta des Zwölfprophetenbuches“, in A. Schart/J. Krispens (Hg.), *Die Stadt im Zwölfprophetenbuch*, BZAW 428, Berlin/Boston 2012, 421-449. Dies., „Geschlechterverhältnisse im Gespräch zwischen griechischer Bibel und antiker Tragödie: Euripides *Helena* und Pentateuch-Überlieferungen“, in C. Elsas/E. Franke/A. Standhartinger (Hg.), *Geschlechtergerechtigkeit: Herausforderung der Religionen*, Berlin 2014, 111-142. Dies., „Auferstehungsmetaphorik in der Septuaginta des Hiobbuches“, in M. Witte/S. Behnke (Hg.), *The Metaphorical Use of Language in Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature*, DCLY 2014/2015, Berlin 2015, 215-232. Dies., "Collective guilt and selfsacrifice in Sophocles' Antigone and II & IV Maccabees. Preliminary cultural-critical remarks", *Journal for Semitics* 24 (2015) 198-215. Dies., "Euripides's Helena and Pentateuch traditions: The Septuagint from the perspective of Ancient Greek Tragedies", *HTS Theologies Studies/ Theological Studies* 71, Art. 2902, 11 pages. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/2902>. Dies., "Genesis 2-3 and Alcibiades' speech in Platon's Symposium: A cultural critical reading", *HTS Theologies Studies/Theological Studies* 71(3), Art. 2903. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/2903>. Dies., „Isaak, die Tochter Jephthas und Iphigenie. Menschenopfer im Alten Testament und im Alten Griechenland. Kulturkritische Beobachtungen unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Septuaginta“, in R.X. Gauthier/G.R. Gotze/G. J. Steyn (Hg.), *Septuagint, Sages, and Scripture. Studies in Honour of Johann Cook*, VTS 172, Leiden/Boston 2016, 1-30. Dies., "Ὁδὲς ἐκὼν κακός? Euripides' *Hippolytus* and Genesis“, *Vetus Testamentum et Hellas* 3 (2016) 58-70. Dies., „Gotteserkenntnis in Platon's *Theaitetus* und in der Septuaginta. Kulturkritische und Sprachtheologische Bemerkungen“, in E.G. Dafni (Hg.), *Gottesschau – Gotteserkenntnis. Studien zur Theologie der Septuaginta* 1, WUNT 387, Tübingen 2017, 232-269.

Mit der Einrichtung einer Professur für „Altes Testament – Septuaginta“ am selben Fachbereich wurde erst in jüngster Zeit Raum sowohl im Grundstudium als auch im postgraduierten Studium zur systematischen Einführung in die historischen, philologischen und theologischen Fragestellungen der Septuaginta-forschung sowie zu komparativischen Untersuchungen der Septuaginta als Quelle der Hymnographie der Orthodoxen Kirche in Griechenland gegeben. Dabei wurde 2014 die erste griechische, akademische Online-Zeitschrift „*Vetus Testamentum et Hellas*“ (<http://ejournals.lib.auth.gr/vteh>) an der Aristoteles-Universität von Thessaloniki herausgegeben. Sie konzentriert sich ausschließlich auf das Alte Testament und die Septuaginta-Studien unter besonderer Berücksichtigung ihrer Interaktion mit der altgriechischen Sprach- und Gedankenwelt. Sie veröffentlicht u.a. Beiträge zur Septuaginta im Vergleich zur griechischen Literatur und Kultur und zielt auch darauf ab, originäre und innovative Forschung herauszufordern, um auf diese Weise einen beachtenswerten Beitrag zur internationalen Diskussion über die Methode der Exegese und der Theologie des Alten Testaments und der Septuaginta leisten zu können. Dazu dienen sollen a) die 2017 herausgegebene Subreihe der „*Wissenschaftlichen Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament I*“ (Mohr Siebeck Verlag) mit dem Titel „*Studien zur Theologie der Septuaginta*“⁴¹ und b) die 2018 begründete griechische Fachreihe „*Παλαιὰ Διαθήκη – Μετάφρασις τῶν Ἑβδομήκοντα* / *Vetus Testamentum – Septuaginta*“ (Ostrakon Publishing, Thessaloniki)⁴².

EVANGELIA G. DAFNI
Aristoteles Universität Thessaloniki
Griechenland
edafni@past.auth.gr

⁴¹ Dafni (Hg.), *Gottesschau – Gotteserkenntnis*.

⁴² Dafni, Ἀγνωσία καὶ Γνώσις Θεοῦ.

Septuagint Research in the Netherlands

MICHAËL N. VAN DER MEER

The fiftieth anniversary of our International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies is a good moment to look back at the past and review the history of research done over the last decades.¹ When studying the history of research in my own country, I found it useful to include the whole of its history starting at the Humanist period.² On the other hand, I have excluded all studies pertaining to the writings outside the Hebrew canon (e.g. the books of Maccabees and other so-called deuterocanonical or pseudepigraphical writings) because they deserve a history of research on their own.³ Needless to say, this short overview can not aim at completeness, but hopes to sketch some major developments and trends.

1. Humanism

Septuagint research in the Netherlands is rooted in the Humanist tradition of text-critical and philological study of the Biblical texts. Probably the most influential humanist, Desiderius Erasmus (1466?-1536), had a Dutch background (Rotterdam), but spent most of his academic life outside the Netherlands and devoted his energy rather to the New Testament.⁴ Among his

¹ It is my pleasant duty to thank Prof.Dr. Siegfried Kreuzer for his kind invitation to write this article and Prof.Dr. Arie van der Kooij for his support and critical remarks.

² See for a general overview of Old Testament research in Holland and Belgium: Klaas Spronk, ed., *The Present State of Old Testament Studies in the Low Countries*, OtSt 69 (Leiden: Brill: 2016).

³ This applies e.g. to the almost completely forgotten dissertation on 3 Maccabees by Jakob Cohen, *Judaica et Aegyptiaca. De Maccabaeorum libro III quaestiones historicae*, PhD diss., Rijksuniversiteit Groningen (Groningen: de Waal, 1941), as well as to the better known works of Jan-Willem van Henten on the Maccabees, Pancratius Beentjes and Otto Mulder on Sirach, Jacques van Ruiten on Jubilees and Adam van der Woude, Pieter van der Horst, and Johannes Magliano-Tromp on a wide variety of Early Jewish writings.

⁴ See Erika Rummel, "The Textual and Hermeneutic Work of Desiderius Erasmus of Rotterdam," in *From the Renaissance to the Enlightenment*, vol. 2 of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament. The History of Its Interpretation, ed. Magne Sæbø, Michael Fishbane and Jean Louis Ska (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2008) (= HBOT 2), 215-30.

younger contemporaries, however, study of the Septuagint gained more attention, not least because of the monumental printing enterprises of the polyglots in Madrid (1514-1517), Antwerp (1568-1572) and later Paris (1628-1645) and London (1653-1658).⁵ One of these Dutch humanists was Andreas Masius (Maes, 1514-1573). He was raised in the Southern Netherlands (modern Belgium), but active in the Northern Netherlands at Zevenaar near Arnhem. Masius published a polyglot (Hebrew-Greek-Latin) edition of the book of Joshua with text-critical notes and a commentary.⁶ That work is still valuable because of the Syro-Hexapla manuscript that Masius used and which has gone missing after Masius's days.⁷ Since no other complete exemplar of the book of Joshua in the Syro-Hexapla has been preserved, Masius' edition is still a unique source for determining hexaplaric readings and Origen's text-critical activity. Half a century later one of the first precursors of Field's collection of Hexaplaric readings was prepared and published posthumously in 1622 by Johannes Drusius (van den Driesche, 1550-1616) in Arnhem.⁸

⁵ Adrian Schenker, "Early Printings of the Bible," and "The Polyglot Bibles of Antwerp, Paris and London 1568-1658," in HBOT 2, 276-91, 774-84.

⁶ Andreas Masius, *Josuae imperatoris historia illustrata et explicata ab Andrea Masio* (Antwerp: Plantin: 1574). The commentary part has been reprinted in *Critica Sacri* (1698) 2, 3-553, and from there into Migne's series *Sacrae Scripturae Cursus Completus* (1839), volumes 7 (851-1126), 8 and 9 (9-458). See Henry de Vocht, "Andreas Masius (1514-1573)," in *Letteratura Classica e Umanistica*, vol. 4 of *Miscellanea Giovanni Mercati*, ed. Giovanni Mercati, Leo Cunibert Mohlberg, *Studi e Testi* 124 (Vatican: Bibliotheca apostolica Vaticana, 1946), 425-41; Jarel Wicks, "Catholic Old Testament Interpretation," in HBOT 2, 617-48, esp. 641-42; Wim François, "Andreas Masius (1514-1573): Humanist, Exegete and Syriac Scholar," *Journal of Eastern Christian Studies* 61 (2009), 199-244; Theodor Dunkelgrün, "The Hebrew Library of a Renaissance Humanist: Andreas Masius and the Bibliography to his *Iosuae Imperatoris Historia* (1574), with a Latin Edition and an Annotated English Translation," *Studia Rosenthaliana* 42-43 (2010-11), 197-252. I owe the references to the latter two comprehensive article to Joris De Beul, chairman of the "Andreas Masius-kring" in Lennik, Belgium.

⁷ Max L. Margolis, "Andreas Masius and His Commentary on the Book of Joshua," unpublished typescript 1923, wrote a long and very detailed study devoted to Masius' Commentary and the underlying Syro-Hexapla manuscript, but did not succeed in finding a publisher. See further Willem Baars, *New Syro-Hexaplaric Texts. Edited, Commented upon and Compared with the Septuagint* (Leiden: Brill, 1968), 1-27; Arthur Vööbus, *The Hexapla and the Syro-Hexapla. Very Important Discoveries for Septuagint Research*, Papers of the Estonian Theological Society in Exile 22 (Stockholm: Etse, 1971); Ignacio Carbajosa, "Syro-Hexapla," in *Textual History of the Bible* 1a, ed. Armin Lange, Emanuel Tov (Leiden: Brill, 2016), 362b-368a.

⁸ Johannes Drusius, *Veterum interpretum graecorum quae extant in totum Vetus Testamentum fragmenta, collecta, versa et notis illustrata* (Arnhem: Jan Jansz, 1622). See Sidney Jellicoe, *The Septuagint and Modern Study* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1968), 127-33.

The founding of the protestant universities in the Northern Netherlands as a counterpart of the Catholic University in Leuven gave a strong impulse to biblical studies. The first protestant university was founded at Leiden in 1575.⁹ Franeker (1585), Groningen (1614), Utrecht (1636) and Harderwijk (1648) soon followed. Leiden University managed to attract the humanist Huguenot scholar Joseph Justus Scaliger (1540-1609), who was by then already famous for his critical editions of Classical writings and his work on chronology.¹⁰ Scaliger's contribution to Septuagint scholarship lies in his critical assessment of the presumed historicity of the Letter of Aristeas.¹¹ His deconstruction of the authenticity of that classical document met vehement opposition by younger contemporaries, most notably by Isaac Vossius (1616-1689). Vossius gave preference to the authority of the Septuagint and therefore to the veracity of the Letter of Aristeas partly because of his veneration for the patristic tradition in which the Greek rather than the Hebrew Old Testament formed the basis for biblical study. Vossius hoped that the patristic tradition could offer a theological basis for common ground for both Catholics and Protestants. Furthermore, he was impressed by the investigations of Jesuit priests in China and concluded from their reports that the great deluge must have been a local phenomenon and that the world must have been much older than hitherto thought.¹² Since the Greek Genesis offers much longer dates for the lives of the patriarchs and therefore a much longer age for the world's existence, Vossius concluded that the Septuagint version (of Genesis) deserved much more credit than the Hebrew.¹³ The debate about the status of the Septuagint that followed had little to do with a unprejudiced study of the Greek translation

⁹ Willem Otterspeer, *Het bolwerk van de vrijheid. De Leidse Universiteit 1575-1672*, vol. 1 of *Groepsportret met Dame* (Amsterdam: Bert Bakker, 2000).

¹⁰ Anthony T. Grafton, *Joseph Scaliger: A Study in the History of Classical Scholarship* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1983).

¹¹ Joseph Justus Scaliger, *Thesaurus temporum Eusebii Pamphili Caesareae Palaestinae episcopi Chronicorum canonum omnimodae historiae libri duo, interprete Hieronymi ex fide vetustissimorum Codicum castigati* (Leiden: Thomas Basson, 1606). See Jellicoe, *The Septuagint and Modern Study*, 31-32, and Natalio Fernández Marcos, *The Septuagint in Context. Introduction to the Greek Versions of the Bible* (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 39. The first comprehensive deconstruction of the historicity of the Letter of Aristeas was made by Humphrey Hody in 1684 in his treatise *Contra historiam LXX interpretum Aristee nomine inscriptam dissertation* (Oxford: Litchfield, 1684).

¹² Isaac Vossius, *Dissertatio de vera aetate mundi qua ostenditur natale mundi tempus annis minimum 1440 vulgarem aeram anticipare* (The Hague: Adriaen Vlacq, 1659).

¹³ Isaac Vossius, *De septuaginta interpretibus, eorumque translatione [sic] & chronologia dissertationes* (The Hague: Adriaen Vlacq, 1661).

of the Hebrew Bible, but far more with dogmatic positions and attitudes towards Judaism in general.¹⁴

Scaliger also made a lasting contribution to Septuagint studies in general and in the Netherlands in particular by obtaining several highly valuable and unique Oriental manuscripts, including the oldest complete manuscript and master-copy for any edition of the Talmud Yerushalmi (Or. 4720) and the famous Arabic translation of the Samaritan book of Joshua (Or. 249).¹⁵ Some decades after Scaliger's death the university library acquired from Isaac Vossius the fifth century CE Septuagint Octateuch, Codex Colberto-Sarravianus (Voss.Gr. Q 8), which contains a lot of the Hexaplaric signs lost in many other Septuagint manuscripts.¹⁶

During most of the seventeenth, eighteenth and nineteenth centuries biblical and Oriental studies were focused on the Semitic languages (Hebrew, Aramaic, Syriac and Arabic), rather than the Greek translations of Hebrew Scriptures. Thomas Erpenius (1584-1624) and Albert Schultens (1686-1750) studied the links between Hebrew, Aramaic, Arabic and Ethiopic and laid the basis for comparative Semitic philology,¹⁷ whereas enlightened scholars such as Hugo Grotius (1583-1645), René Descartes (1596-1650) and Baruch de Spinoza (1632-1677) sought to rationalize the Bible.¹⁸ The main work of collecting and collating Hebrew and Greek manuscripts of the Old Testament was mainly performed in Britain by Kennicott, Holmes and Parsons, Field, Swete, Brooke, McLean and Thackeray or in Germany by von Tischendorf.¹⁹

¹⁴ See the detailed description by Jürgen C.H. Lebram, "Ein Streit um die hebräische Bibel und die Septuaginta," in *Leiden University in the Seventeenth Century: An Exchange of Learning*, ed. Th.H. Lunsingh Scheurleer, Guillaume H.M. Posthumus Meyjes (Leiden: Universitaire pers/Brill, 1975), 21-63.

¹⁵ Robert M. Kerr, *Vetus Testamentum in Lugduno Batavorum. Catalogue of an Exhibition of Old Testament Manuscripts held in the Leiden University Library July 1st–August 7th 2004 on the Occasion of the XVIIIth Congress of the International Organization for the Study of the Old Testament (IOSOT) at Leiden (1-6 August 2004)*, Kleine publicaties van de Leidse Universiteitsbibliotheek 60 (Leiden: Leiden University Library, 2004),

¹⁶ Jellicoe, *The Septuagint and Modern Study*, 192; Detlef Fraenkel, *Die Überlieferung bis zum VIII. Jahrhundert*, vol. 1.1 of *Verzeichnis der griechischen Handschriften des Alten Testaments, Septuaginta Vetus Testamentum Graecum auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis editum Supplementum* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004), 184-87.

¹⁷ Stephen G. Burnett, "Later Christian Hebraists," in *HBOT* 2, 785-801.

¹⁸ H.J.M. Nellen, "Growing Tension between Church Doctrines and Critical Exegesis of the Old Testament," and Steven Nadler, "The Bible Hermeneutics of Baruch de Spinoza," in *HBOT* 2, 802-36.

¹⁹ See Karen H. Jobes and Moisés Silva, *Invitation to the Septuagint* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2000), 239-57.

2. Textual Criticism and Translation Technique

Septuagint studies entered a new stage with the program formulated by Paul Anton de Lagarde (1827-1891) and executed by his pupil, Alfred Rahlfs (1865-1935), to reconstruct the original text of the Septuagint on the basis of all the extant sources including the daughter versions by first isolating the several revisions of the Septuagint presumably made by Hesychian in Egypt, Lucian in Syria and Origen in Palestine.²⁰ As a result a large number of dissertations and other studies appeared, mainly in Germany, which focused on the translation technique of specific books. Well known are the studies of Frankel on the Pentateuch (1851), Wellhausen on Samuel (1872), De Lagarde on Proverbs (1863) and somewhat lesser known those of Hollenberg on Joshua (1876), and Scholz on Isaiah (1880), to mention only a few studies.²¹

It is against this background that the first modern Septuagint studies in the Netherlands should be seen. In 1887 the first Dutch doctoral dissertation on the Septuagint appeared, written by J.Z. Schuurmans Stekhoven (1858-1890).²² He tried to implement the program set out by De Lagarde of reconstructing the original text of the Septuagint by identifying the Lucianic and Hesychian recensions (chapters 3 and 4). The larger part of his dissertation (pp. 70-126; chapter 6) is devoted to a first attempt to describe the translation technique of the Greek Dodekapropheton translator (chapter 6). Schuurmans Stekhoven paid due attention to the translation technique of syntactical features before discussing some theologically motivated transformations. He notes both the Greek translator's preference for idiolect renderings and his variation in Greek equivalents for the same Hebrew word. On the whole, however, his verdict on the translation and the competences of the Greek translator is rather

²⁰ Thus Jellicoe, *The Septuagint and Modern Study*, 1-25.

²¹ Zacharias Frankel, *Vorstudien zu der Septuaginta* (Leipzig: Vogel, 1841); Julius Wellhausen, *Der Text der Bücher Samuelis* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1871); Paul A. de Lagarde, *Anmerkungen zur griechischen Übersetzung der Proverben* (Leipzig: Brockhaus, 1863); Johannes Hollenberg, *Der Charakter der alexandrinischen Uebersetzung des Buches Josua und ihr textkritischer Werth untersucht*, Wissenschaftliche Beilage zu dem Oster-Programm des Gymnasiums zu Moers (Moers: Eckner, 1876); Anton Scholz, *Die alexandrinische Übersetzung des Buches Jesaias* (Würzburg: Woerl, 1880).

²² J.Z. Schuurmans Stekhoven, *De alexandrijnsche vertaling van het Dodekapropheton*, PhD diss., Rijksuniversiteit Groningen (Leiden: Brill, 1887). Two decades earlier a doctoral dissertation by J.C. Schagen van Soelen, *Over den oorsprong der Grieksche vertaling van de Pentateuch volgens de LXX* (Leiden: P. Engels, 1864) had appeared under the supervision of Abraham Kuenen. However, as the author himself declared in his introduction, this overview had little new insights to offer.

negative.²³ Hence, caution is needed when the Greek translation is used for text-critical operations in the Dodekapropheton.

A year later one of the pupils of the famous Leiden Old Testament professor Abraham Kuenen (1828-1891),²⁴ Isaäc Hooykaas (1837-1894), published a relatively short overview of the state of Septuagint research.²⁵ He offered an overview of the state of Septuagint research and discussed several differences between the B-text and the so-called Lucianic text of 3 Regum (1 Kings).²⁶ He concluded that the differences between LXX and MT and among the witnesses of LXX themselves point to a long process of different redactions of the book of Kings.²⁷

Hooykaas' hopes that the Netherlands would produce a scholar capable to address the text-critical problems of the Septuagint and the Hebrew Bible found fulfillment in the works of Piet(er) de Boer (1910-1989), who would be one of Kuenen's successors on the Leiden chair of Old Testament (1938-1978).²⁸ De

²³ Schuurmans Stekhoven, *De alexandrijnsche vertaling*, 113: "Reeds eene vluchtige vergelijking van de twaalf profeten kan leeren, hoe dikwerf ¶ onzin terneergeschreven heeft, daar hij niets van het Hebreeuwsch begreep, niet alleen op moeilijke, maar ook op gemakkelijke plaatsen."

²⁴ See e.g. Piet B. Dirksen, Arie van der Kooij, eds., *Abraham Kuenen (1828-1891). His Major Contributions to the Study of the Old Testament*, OtSt 29 (Leiden: Brill, 1993); Rudolf Smend, "The Work of Abraham Kuenen and Julius Wellhausen," in *The Nineteenth Century-A Century of Modernism and Historicism*, vol. 3.1 of *The Hebrew Bible/Old Testament. The History of Its Interpretation*, ed. Magne Sæbø, Peter Machinist and Jean Louis Ska (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2013), 424-53.

²⁵ Isaäc Hooykaas, *Iets over de Grieksche vertaling van het Oude Testament*, programma van het Erasmiaans Gymnasium voor 1888/89 (Rotterdam: Eeltjes, 1888).

²⁶ Hooykaas was minister in the Remonstrant church at Rotterdam and the spiritual father of the Leiden translation of the Bible (Abraham Kuenen, Isaäc Hooykaas, Willem H. Koster, Henricus Oort, *Het Oude Testament opnieuw uit den grondtekst overgezet en van inleidingen en aantekeningen voorzien* [Leiden: Brill, 1899-1912]). The Leidse Vertaling was intended as a scientific translation based on critically restored base-texts for the Old and New Testaments (the Nestle edition for the NT, for the OT see Henricus Oort, *Textus hebraici emendations quibus in vetere Testamento Neerlandice vertendo* [Leiden: Brill, 1900]). Precisely because of this scientific character the translation was hardly used in the churches, see Cees Houtman, "De Leidse en Utrechtse vertaling," in *Om een verstaanbare Bijbel. Nederlandse bijbelvertalingen na de Statenvertaling*, ed. Alfons W.G. Jaakke and Evert W. Tuinstra (Haarlem: Nederlands Bijbelgenootschap, 1990), 201-24.

²⁷ Hooykaas, *Grieksche vertaling*, 20: "De slotsom ligt voor de hand: het onderzoek der LXX verspreidt licht over de wordingsgeschiedenis van *Koningen* en bewijst dat er nog langen tijd verschillende redacties van in omloop waren, ja, dat er nog eeuwen na de vervaardiging op meer dan ééne wijze aan gewerkt is." Cf Abraham Kuenen, *Historisch-critisch onderzoek naar het ontstaan en de verzameling van de boeken des Ouden Verbonds*, tweede, geheel omgewerkte uitgave (Leiden: Engels, 1887), 426-29.

²⁸ See e.g. the *in memoriam* by G.W. Anderson, "P.A.H. de Boer," *VT* 40 (1990), 1-3.

Boer took up the challenges formulated in Wellhausen's and Driver's works on the books of Samuel²⁹ to broaden text-critical research of these complex books by including the data from the Targum and Peshitta to the books of Samuel.³⁰ De Boer stressed the interpretative character of the Greek translation and as a result its subordinate value for text-critical use of the Hebrew Bible. With the discovery of 4QSamuel^a, which supports many Septuagintal readings, De Boer's position became subject to harsh criticism.³¹ Old Testament text-critical research at Leiden in the decades after the Second World War concentrated mainly on the critical edition of the Peshitta.³² Groningen University would install a Qumran Institute under supervision of Adam S. van der Woude and later Florentino García Martínez³³ and Kampen University would specialize in Ugaritic and later Targum studies under Johannes C. de Moor.³⁴ This left Septuagint research for other academic centers outside the Netherlands, although several dissertations prepared under supervision of De Boer touched upon Septuagint studies.³⁵ Nevertheless, the work on the Syriac versions of the Old Testament did produce valuable information for Septuagint studies because of the

²⁹ Wellhausen, *Der Text der Bücher Samuelis*; Samuel R. Driver, *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel with an Introduction on Hebrew Palaeography and the Ancient Versions* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1890).

³⁰ Pieter A.H. de Boer, *Research into the Text of 1 Samuel I-XVI. A Contribution to the Study of Samuel* (Amsterdam: H.J. Paris, 1938). See also his later studies: "1 Samuel xvii. Notes on the Text and the Ancient Versions," in *OtSt* 1 (Leiden: Brill, 1942), 79-104; id., "Research into the Text of 1 Samuel xviii-xxxi," in *OtSt* 6 (Leiden: Brill, 1949), 1-100; idem, "Confirmatum est cor meum. Remarks on the Old Latin Text of the Song of Hannah," in *Studies on Psalms*, ed. P.A.H. de Boer, *OtSt* 13 (Leiden: Brill, 1963), 173-92; id., "Once Again the Old Latin Text of Hannah's Song," in *OtSt* 14 (Leiden: Brill, 1965), 206-13. Piet de Boer was the first Dutch scholar to contribute to the Stuttgart edition of the *Biblia Hebraica*, see id., "Libri Samuelis," in *Biblia hebraica Stuttgartensia*, ed. Karl Elliger and Wilhelm Rudolph (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1976).

³¹ See e.g. Frank M. Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumran and Modern Biblical Studies. The Haskell Lectures 1956-1957* (New York: Doubleday, 1958), 177 n. 20.

³² See for a history of Peshitta research e.g. Peter B. Dirksen, "The Old Testament Peshitta," in *Mikra. Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*, ed. Martin Jan Mulder, Harry Sysling, CRINT 2.1 (Assen: Van Gorcum; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988), 255-97 and Michael P. Weitzman, *The Syriac Version of the Old Testament. An Introduction*, University of Cambridge Oriental Publications 56 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 1-14.

³³ <http://www.rug.nl/research/centre-for-religious-studies/qumran-institute/>

³⁴ <http://www.targum.nl/>.

³⁵ Taeke Jansma, "Inquiry into the Hebrew Text and the Ancient Versions of Zechariah ix-xiv," PhD diss. Leiden University (Leiden: Brill, 1949), revised edition in *OtSt* 7 (Leiden: Brill, 1950), 1-142; Joost Smit Sibinga, *The Old Testament Text of Justin Martyr 1. The Pentateuch* (only volume published), PhD diss. Leiden University (Leiden: Brill, 1963); Jan

discoveries of additional fragments of the Syro-Hexapla as well as occasional fragments of Greek manuscripts.³⁶

3. Hermeneutics and Historical Context

With the appearance of the first volumes in the Göttingen series Septuagint research entered a new phase. It now became possible to study questions of hermeneutics, historical and cultural context and even authorship of the Greek translations on the basis of a reliable text-critical edition. One of the first studies of this kind was carried out by Isac Leo Seeligmann in his 1948 Leiden dissertation on *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah*.³⁷ Already by the beginning of the Second World War in 1940 Seeligmann had surveyed the whole of Septuagint research.³⁸ In his *opus magnum* on Isaiah, conceived while he was still in the Nazi concentration camp at Theresienstadt,³⁹ he discussed the textual history, the translation technique, historical context and theology of the Old Greek Isaiah. Particularly his study of the date and historical background of the Septuagint of Isaiah has remained highly influential. Seeligmann placed the Greek Isaiah within the setting of second century BCE Alexandria with traces of an exegesis current in circles around high priest Onias who had fled to Egypt from the Seleucid politics under Antiochus IV Epiphanes.⁴⁰ According to Seeligmann this exegesis saw many of the original prophecies fulfilled

de Waard, *A Comparative Study of the Old Testament Text in the Dead Sea scrolls and in the New Testament*, PhD diss. Leiden University (Leiden: Brill, 1965).

³⁶ See e.g. Willem Baars, "A Forgotten Fragment of the Greek Text of the Books of Samuel," in *OtSt* 14 (Leiden: Brill, 1965), 201-5; id., *New Syro-Hexaplaric Texts*.

³⁷ Isac Leo Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version of the Book of Isaiah: A Discussion of Its Problems*, Mededelingen en Verhandelingen van het Vooraziatisch-Egyptisch Genootschap "Ex Oriente Lux" 9 (Leiden: Brill, 1948, reprinted in *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah and Cognate Studies*, ed. Robert Hanhart, Hermann Spieckermann, FAT 40 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004). For a personal sketch of Seeligmann, see Rudolf Smend, "Begegnung mit Isac Leo Seeligmann," in *Isac Leo Seeligmann, Gesammelte Studien zur Hebräischen Bibel*, ed. Erhard Blum, FAT 41 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004), 469-92. All my references are to the first edition.

³⁸ Isac Leo Seeligmann, "Problemen en perspectieven in het modern Septuaginta-onderzoek," *JEOL* 7 (1940), 359-90, translated as "Problems and perspectives in modern Septuagint research," in *Textus* 15 (1990), 169-232, reprinted in *The Septuagint of Isaiah and Cognate Studies*, 23-82.

³⁹ Seeligmann, *The Septuagint of Isaiah*, xi.

⁴⁰ Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah*, 70-94. In an excursus on "Onias III and the Oniad Temple in Heliopolis," *ibidem*, 91-94, Seeligmann discusses the question whether the Onias in question is Onias III or his son Onias IV. He prefers the first option, although many researchers after him favor Onias IV. Equally confusing is the name of the location of

in his own day and translated accordingly. As a result the satire on the Assyrian tyrant (Sargon II?) in Isa 14:18-20 became an allusion to the equally shameful death of the Syrian-Hellenistic king Antiochus IV in the LXX.⁴¹ Seeligmann saw Onias' flight to Egypt reflected in the Greek version of Isa 8:8 and 10:24, his establishment of a rival cult in Egypt in 19:12 and 19:19 and the fall of Carthage in 146 BCE and the Philistine cities in 140 BCE in Isa 23:11 and 11:14.⁴² Whereas Septuagintalists seem to have (had) an inhibition against the idea of a Septuagint theology, probably because of fear of reading New Testament and other Christian concepts into a pre-Christian document,⁴³ Seeligmann had no reservations against the idea of a theology of the Septuagint of Isaiah, but made clear that this theology had to be a "Jewish-Alexandrian theology."⁴⁴ Seeligmann discussed the various epithets and attributes ascribed to Israel's God, the characterization of the pagan gods (including Alexandria's protective deities Ἀγαθὸς Δαίμων and Τύχη in Isa 65:11), as well as the prominence of themes including the Temple, the Law (νόμος) and justice (δικαιοσύνη). As a result, the Greek translation of Isaiah should be seen not only as rendering of the Hebrew text, but also as a testimony of its fulfillment as perceived by circles around Onias in the middle of the second century BCE.⁴⁵ Seeligmann's attempt to study the Septuagint within its own cultural and political context has remained his lasting, although not unchallenged contribution. It has inspired several Dutch Septuagint researchers to pursue this line of research in the decades after Seeligmann's promotion.

Seeligmann himself left Amsterdam for Jerusalem to become professor at the Hebrew University. Many Dutch people also migrated after the Second World War to either Israel, Canada, the United States or Australia. This also applies to some of the most prominent Septuagint scholars of the last fifty

the Jewish temple in the land of Egypt: either Heliopolis or Leontopolis in the Heliopolite nome. The confusion is already found in the ancient sources, most notably Josephus.

⁴¹ Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah*, 83-84. For a discussion of the identity of the Assyrian king in the original Hebrew text of Isaiah see e.g. Percy S.F. van Keulen, "On the identity of the Anonymous Ruler in Isaiah 14:4b-21," in *Isaiah in Context. Studies in Honour of Arie van der Kooij on the Occasion of his Sixty-Fifth Birthday*, ed. Michaël N. van der Meer et al., VTSup 138 (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 109-23.

⁴² Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version*, 86-87. The *terminus post quem* of "about 140 A.D." (page 87, line 3) must be an error for "140 BCE."

⁴³ See e.g. James Barr, *The Semantics of Biblical Language* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1961).

⁴⁴ Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version*, 95-121.

⁴⁵ Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version*, 109.

years. John William Wevers (1919-2010), Albert Pietersma (born 1935) and Emanuel Tov (born 1941) all have their roots in the Netherlands.

Seeligmann's search for a historical and cultural setting for the Septuagint found an echo in the much neglected work of Bruno Stricker on the Letter of Aristeas and the origins of the Septuagint.⁴⁶ Whereas biblical scholarship since Scaliger and Hody had dismissed the Letter of Aristeas as fiction devoid of any historical reliability, Stricker argued on the basis of a wealth of classical sources that the pseudepigraphical writing does have a historical kernel and that the notion of a Ptolemaic king ordering the Greek translation of a Jewish law code fits well within the cultural politics of the first Hellenistic (Ptolemaic and Seleucid) courts. Stricker drew upon the parallels offered not only by Manetho, Berossus, Philo of Byblos and Sanchujaton, but also a wealth of contemporaneous Hellenistic writings among which he also included the *Corpus hermeticum*, as well as rabbinical sources. Similar ideas were formulated not much later by Bickerman, Brock and others.⁴⁷

An even stronger echo of Seeligmann's work can be found in the numerous publications of Arie van der Kooij (born 1945). Like De Boer before him, Van der Kooij originally planned to write an exegetical study, but soon found himself entangled in text-critical issues that had to be dealt with on their own. Hence, his doctoral dissertation discusses all the ancient textual witnesses to the book of Isaiah available in the seventies of the previous century (1QIsa^a, 1QIsa^b, Septuagint, Theodotion, Aquila, Symmachus, Targum, Peshitta and Vulgate).⁴⁸ Van der Kooij found traces of fulfillment prophecy in the Old

⁴⁶ Bruno H. Stricker, *De brief van Aristeas. De hellenistische codificaties der praehel-leense godsdiensten*, Verhandelingen der koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van wetenschappen, afd. letterkunde 62/4 (Amsterdam: Noord-Hollandsche Uitgevers maatschappij, 1956).

⁴⁷ Elias Bickerman, "The Septuagint as a Translation," *PAAJR* 27 (1959), reprinted in *Studies in Jewish and Christian History* 1, ed. Elias Bickerman, AGAJU 9 (Leiden: Brill, 1976), 167-200; see also his much earlier discussion "Zur Datierung des Pseudo-Aristeas," *ZNW* 29 (1930), reprinted in *ibidem*, 109-36. Sebastian P. Brock, "The Phenomenon of the Septuagint," in *The Witness of Tradition. Papers Read at the Joint British-Dutch Old Testament Conference Held at Woudschoten, 1970*, ed. Adam S. van der Woude, OtSt 17 (Leiden: Brill, 1972), 11-36, found parallels for state instigated translations in Antiquity in the bilingual Demotic-Greek decrees from Canopus and Rosetta, the Sanskrit-Aramaic-Greek edicts of Asoka found at Kandahar and bilingual Greek-Latin editions of Vergil's texts.

⁴⁸ Arie van der Kooij, "De oude tekstgetuigen van het boek Jesaja," PhD diss., Rijksuniversiteit Utrecht, 1978, translated and revised edition as *Die alten Textzeugen des Jesajabuches. Ein Beitrag zur Textgeschichte des Alten Testaments*, OBO 35; Fribourg: Éditions universitaires; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1981. The Isaiah scrolls from the fourth

Greek version of Isaiah present not only in the passages discussed by Seeligmann, but also in many other instances in the Old Greek Isaiah (e.g. the allusion to the conquest of Babylon by the Parthian Mithridates I in 141-40 BCE in Isa 14:23; and polemics against the Jerusalemite priesthood in Isa 22:15-25). The phenomenon of fulfillment prophecies was widespread in Hellenism and is attested in e.g. the *pesharim* at Qumran, the Sibylline Oracles, but also Egyptian prophetic texts from the Hellenistic period, such as the Oracle of the Lamb and the Oracle of the Potter.⁴⁹

Moreover, he found the same hermeneutical mechanisms active in other ancient versions of the book of Isaiah. According to Van der Kooij, the ancient translators were more than simple dragomans, but learned scholar-scribes who performed their hermeneutical work under supervision of a leading authority.⁵⁰ For the Septuagint of Isaiah this authority would be Onias IV in Leontopolis, who also may have commissioned the Old Greek of Daniel and the Third book of the Sibylline Oracles.⁵¹ Something similar might apply to the authority behind the textual adaptations found in 1QIsa^a (authorized by the Teacher of

Qumran cave became available to scholarship only in the mid-nineteens of the previous century, see Patrick W. Skehan and Eugene Ulrich, "Isaiah," in *Qumran Cave 4.X The Prophets*, ed. Eugene Ulrich et al., DJD XV (Oxford: Clarendon, 1997), 7-144.

⁴⁹ Arie van der Kooij, "The Septuagint of Isaiah and the Mode of Reading Prophecies in Early Judaism. Some Comments on LXX Isaiah 8-9," in *Die Septuaginta-Texte, Kontexte, Lebenswelten. Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 20.-23. Juli 2006*, ed. Martin Karrer, Wolfgang Kraus, WUNT 219 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 597-611; id., "The Old Greek of Isaiah and Other Prophecies Published in Ptolemaic Egypt," in *Die Septuaginta-Texte, Theologien, Einflüsse, 2. Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 23.-27.7.2008*, ed. Wolfgang Kraus, Martin Karrer, Martin Meiser, WUNT 252 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 72-84; idem, "Authoritative Scriptures and Scribal Culture," in *Authoritative Scriptures in Ancient Judaism*, ed. Mladen Popović, JSJSup 141 (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 55-72.

⁵⁰ See also Arie van der Kooij, "Perspectives on the Study of the Septuagint. Who Are the Translators?" in *Perspectives in the Study of the Old Testament and Early Judaism. A Symposium in Honour of Adam S. van der Woude on the Occasion of His 70th Birthday*, ed. Florentino García Martínez and Ed Noort, VTSup 73 (Leiden: Brill, 1998), 214-29; id., "Zur Frage der Exegese im LXX-Psalter. Ein Beitrag zur Verhältnisbestimmung zwischen Original und Übersetzung," in *Der Septuaginta-Psalter und seine Tochterübersetzungen. Symposium in Göttingen 1997*, ed. Anneli Aejmelaeus, Udo Quast, MSU 24 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000), 366-79; id., "The Old Greek of Isaiah 9,6-7 and the Concept of Leadership," in *Die Septuaginta-Text, Wirkung, Rezeption. 4. Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 19.-22. Juli 2012*, ed. Wolfgang Kraus, Siegfried Kreuzer, Martin Meiser, Marcus Sigismund, WUNT 325 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014), 333-45.

⁵¹ Van der Kooij, *Die alten Textzeugen*, 33-65.

Righteousness?),⁵² the revision of Theodotion (school of Rabbi Hillel the Elder),⁵³ Aquila (school of rabbi Aqiba),⁵⁴ the Targum (circle around rabbi and priest Eleazar from Modein and Bar Kochba),⁵⁵ and the Greek revision by Symmachus (circles around rabbi Jehuda ha-Nasi I).⁵⁶

These identifications of the different translators-interpreters of the book of Isaiah throw new light on the much disputed question of messianism in the ancient versions of Isaiah. Whereas a Christological interpretation of the messianic passages in Isaiah in the Vulgate is evident from Jerome's commentaries on Isaiah,⁵⁷ and a Christological interpretation of the Peshitta can be inferred from several Syriac renderings,⁵⁸ the ancient Jewish translator-interpreters found these prophecies fulfilled in the leading Jewish figures of their own times.⁵⁹ The ancient biblical translations, particularly the Septuagint of Isaiah, thus stand out both "as Version and Vision," thus the subtitle of a second monograph by Van der Kooij devoted entirely to the Septuagint of Isaiah 23 (the oracle of Tyre) in the context of contemporary events (the Fall of Carthage) and later interpreters (e.g. Eusebius of Caesarea and Jerome).⁶⁰ Annotations to Greek version of Isa 1-55 prepared by Van der Kooij together with Florian Wilk can be found in the *Erläuterungen* to the *Septuaginta Deutsch*.⁶¹

⁵² Van der Kooij, *Die alten Textzeugen*, 94-97.

⁵³ Van der Kooij, *Die alten Textzeugen*, 125-50.

⁵⁴ Van der Kooij, *Die alten Textzeugen*, 157-60.

⁵⁵ Van der Kooij, *Die alten Textzeugen*, 161-209.

⁵⁶ Van der Kooij, *Die alten Textzeugen*, 221-55. See also idem, "Symmachus, de 'vertaler der Joden'," *NedTT* 42 (1988): 1-20; idem, "The Teacher Messiah and World-Wide Peace: Some Comments on Symmachus' Version of Isaiah 25:7-8," *JNSL* 24 (1998): 75-82.

⁵⁷ Van der Kooij, *Die alten Textzeugen*, 299-320.

⁵⁸ Van der Kooij, *Die alten Textzeugen*, 291-96.

⁵⁹ Arie van der Kooij, "The Servant of the Lord: A Particular Group of Jews in Egypt According to the Old Greek of Isaiah: Some Comments on LXX Isa 49,1-6 and Related Passages," in *Studies in the Book of Isaiah. Festschrift Willem A.M. Beuken*, ed. Jacques van Ruiten, Marc Vervenne, BETHL 122 (Leuven: Peeters, 1997), 383-97; id., "Wie heißt der Messias? Zu Jes 9,5 in den alten griechischen Versionen," in *Vergegenwärtigung des Alten Testaments. Beiträge zur biblischen Hermeneutik. Festschrift für Rudolf Smend zum 70. Geburtstag*, ed. Christoph Bultmann, Walter Dietrich, Christoph Levin (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2002), 156-69.

⁶⁰ Arie van der Kooij, *The Oracle of Tyre. The Septuagint of Isaiah XXIII as Version and Vision*, VTSup 71 (Leiden: Brill, 1998).

⁶¹ Jürgen Kabiersch, Arie van der Kooij, Klaus Koenen, Florian Wilk, Klaus Balzer, "Esaias. Das Buch Jesaja," in *Septuaginta Deutsch. Das griechische Alte Testament in deutscher Übersetzung*, Wolfgang Kraus, Martin Karrer (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft,

Already before Van der Kooij became professor Old Testament at Leiden University (1989-2010), he had broadened his scientific horizon beyond the book of Isaiah, even if that book continues to be the focus of his interest up until today. As member of the editorial committee of the *Biblia Hebraica Quinta* from the very first beginning, Van der Kooij is responsible for a new edition of the Hebrew text of Isaiah.⁶² His research interests also pertain to the Greek versions of the Pentateuch, Regum, Psalms, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, the Twelve Prophets, Daniel, Ben Sira and 1 Esdras.⁶³ Van der Kooij has dealt with the question of the relation between textual criticism and redaction criticism as reflected by considerable quantitative variants in the Septuagint. Against the *communis opinio* that the longer version of Jeremiah as attested in MT would present a later redaction of a shorter version as attested in LXX, Van der Kooij defended the alternative option. He argued that the omission of a vital passage in the Old Greek of Jeremiah, MT-Jer 33:14-26, a messianic prophecy about the perpetuation of the Davidic dynasty along with the Levitical priesthood, is the result of a deliberate curtailment of the original text, because it did not fit the monarchic ideas current in the second century BCE.⁶⁴ Redaction-critical investigations should not be made subservient to text-critical hypotheses, but deserve their own right. When the two approaches coincide, such as in the case of Joshua 20, one may speak of an overlap. In the famous case of the story of David and Goliath, however, Van der Kooij finds it more plausible to assume that the Greek translator has curtailed the doublets in the longer Hebrew text as attested by MT, than vice-versa.⁶⁵

Under Van der Kooij's supervision a number of Septuagint research projects, both doctoral and post-doctoral, were completed. In 1997 Kristin De Troyer (born 1963, now professor in Salzburg) completed her dissertation on

2009), 1230-86; id., "Esaías Isaías / Das Buch Jesaja," in *Septuaginta Deutsch. Erläuterungen und Kommentare zum griechischen Alten Testament*, ed. Martin Karrer, Wolfgang Kraus (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2011), volume II, 2483-2607, 2646-72.

⁶² So also his contributions on textual criticism of the Old Testament in e.g. *TRE* 33 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2001), 148-55 and *The Oxford Handbook of Biblical Studies*, ed. John W. Rogerson, Judith M. Lieu (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 579-90.

⁶³ For a full bibliography of all his publications until 2010, see the "Bibliography of Arie van der Kooij," in *Isaiah in Context*, ed. Van der Meer et al., 429-38.

⁶⁴ Arie van der Kooij, "Zum Verhältnis von Textkritik und Literarkritik: Überlegungen anhand einiger Beispiele," in *Congress Volume. Cambridge 1995*, ed. John A. Emerton, VTSup 66 (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 185-202.

⁶⁵ Arie van der Kooij, "The Story of David and Goliath: The Early History of Its Text," *ETL* 68 (1992): 118-31.

the Greek versions of the book of Esther.⁶⁶ De Troyer made it clear that these versions, the LXX and the so-called Alpha-Text, should be studied in their own right. She concludes that the LXX version is both a translation and redaction of the Hebrew text and responsible for the incorporation of the major addition “E” in Esther 8. The A-Text is an inner-Greek revision of the LXX and probably written by Agrippa, the later king of Jews, when he rescued the Jews in Alexandria in 40-41 CE.

Percy van Keulen (born 1963) had already written a dissertation on synchronic and diachronic approaches to the story of king Manasseh in 1995,⁶⁷ when he took up the task to entangle the text-critical difficulties in 1 Kings 1-12.⁶⁸ His meticulous analysis of the complexities of rearrangement, omissions and additions of miscellanies received wide acclaim by prominent Septuagint scholars.⁶⁹ In good Leiden fashion and in line with the conclusions reached earlier by David Gooding, Van Keulen concluded that the numerous variants between the Hebrew and Greek versions of 1 Kings 1-12 are the result of the Greek translator, who was a translator and redactor at the same time.

My own doctoral research addressed the same question of the relationship between textual criticism and redaction criticism as applied to three crucial chapters in the book of Joshua (Josh 1, 5 and 8).⁷⁰ The Greek version of Joshua has a lot of minuses vis-à-vis the Masoretic Text as well as a case of transposition of a late (deuteron-)nomistic passage (MT-Josh 8:30-35 = LXX-Josh 9:2a-f). The publication of the Qumran scrolls of Joshua had complicated the picture further by aligning with the MT in the minor details, but offering yet a third position of the curious Ebal and Gerizim passage (MT Josh 8:30-35) before

⁶⁶ Kristin M.L.L. De Troyer, *Het einde van de Alpha-Tekst van Ester. Vertaal- en verhaaltechniek van MT 8,1-17, LXX 8,1-17 en AT 7,14-41*, PhD diss. Leiden University (Leuven: Peeters, 1997), translated and revised: *The End of the Alpha Text of Esther: Translation and Narrative Technique in MT 8:1-17, LXX 8:1-17, and AT 7:14-41*, SBLSCS 48 (Atlanta: Scholars, 1999).

⁶⁷ Percy S.F. van Keulen, *Manasseh through the Eyes of the Deuteronomists. The Manasseh Account (2 Kings 21:1-18) and the Final Chapters of the Deuteronomistic History*, PhD diss., Leiden University 1995, revised edition in OtSt 38 (Leiden: Brill, 1996).

⁶⁸ Percy S.F. van Keulen, *Two Versions of the Solomon Narrative. An Inquiry into the Relationship between MT 1 Kgs. 2-11 and LXX 3 Reg 2-11*, VTSup 104 (Leiden: Brill, 2005).

⁶⁹ See e.g. Emanuel Tov, “Three Strange Books of the LXX: 1 Kings, Esther and Daniel Compared with Similar Compositions from Qumran and Elsewhere,” in *Die Septuaginta – Texte, Kontexte, Lebenswelten*, ed. Karrer, Kraus, 369-93, reprinted in *Hebrew Bible, Greek Bible, and Qumran*, ed. Emanuel Tov, TSAJ 121 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 283-305.

⁷⁰ Michaël N. van der Meer, *Formation and Reformulation. The Redaction of the Book of Joshua in the Light of the Oldest Textual Witnesses*, PhD diss., Leiden University (Leiden, 2001), revised edition in VTSup 102 (Leiden: Brill, 2004). My year of birth is 1968.

Josh 5:2. A careful examination of both the redaction and formation process of the Hebrew text and an independent analysis of the Greek reformulation of that redactionally layered and redundant Hebrew text convinced me that here too the Greek translator was both interpreter and reviser. Something similar applies, to my mind, to the scribe of 4QJoshua^a, who duplicated parts of Josh 8:30-35 between Josh 5:1 and 5:2 in a manner similar to the duplications known from pre-Samaritan texts.⁷¹ In later studies devoted to other parts of the book of Joshua I reached comparable results:⁷² the Septuagint should not be seen only as a slavish and unintelligent rendering of a Hebrew text that may have differed occasionally from the received Masoretic tradition, but is first and foremost a very early example of scholarly interpretation of that Hebrew text as attested both by MT and the vast majority of Qumran biblical manuscripts.

The year 2004 was an important year for Dutch Septuagint studies because the XVIIIth Congress of the IOSOT and the XIIth Congress of the IOSCS were held in Leiden. A special panel was devoted to a self-evident, but much neglected part of Septuagint studies, viz. that of translation studies. In the presence of the founding father of Descriptive Translation Studies, Gideon Toury, the relevance of this theoretical framework for Septuagint studies, particularly the NETS project and Pietersma's interlinear model was discussed.⁷³ Among the dissenting voices at that congress was that of Theo van der Louw (born 1967) who defended his doctoral dissertation at Leiden two years later.⁷⁴ In a highly original contribution to the field, Van der Louw made it clear that Septuagint scholars are ill advised not to take into account the results of translation

⁷¹ See Michaël N. van der Meer, "Exclusion and Expansion: Harmonisations in the Samaritan Pentateuch, pre-Samaritan Pentateuchal Manuscripts and non-Pentateuchal Manuscripts," in *The Samaritan Pentateuch in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. Michael Langlois (CBET, forthcoming).

⁷² Michaël N. van der Meer, "'Sound the Trumpet!' Redaction and Reception of Joshua 6:2-25," in *The Land of Israel in Bible, History, and Theology. Studies in Honour of Ed Noort*, VTSup 124 (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 19-44; id., "Clustering Cluttered Areas: Textual and Literary Criticism in Joshua 8,1-10," in *The Book of Joshua*, ed. Ed Noort, BETL 250 (Leuven: Peeters, 2012), 87-106; id., "Literary and Textual History of Joshua 2," in *XV Congress of the IOSCS, Munich 2013*, eds. Wolfgang Kraus, Michaël N. van der Meer, and Martin Meiser, SBLSCS 64 (Atlanta: SBL, 2016), 565-91.

⁷³ The papers of that panel were published in *BIOSCS* 39 (2006), 1-91. The other contributions to the IOSCS congress appeared as Melvin K.H. Peters, ed., *XII Congress of the IOSCS, Leiden, 2004*, SBLSCS 54 (Atlanta: SBL, 2006).

⁷⁴ Theo van der Louw, "Approaches in Translation Studies and Their Use for the Study of the Septuagint," in *XII Congress*, ed. Peters, 17-28; id., *Transformations in the Septuagint. Towards an Interaction of Septuagint Studies and Translation Studies*, PhD diss., Leiden University 2006, revised edition in CBET 47 (Leuven: Peeters, 2007).

studies as has been the custom for decades. Whereas most studies on translation technique in the Septuagint have focused on degrees of literalness, he offers a theoretical framework based on both ancient and modern translation studies to describe the non-literal transformations in the Greek translation. Van der Louw holds that “behind each transformation stands a literal rendering that has been rejected.”⁷⁵ He applied his framework of different types of transformations to three chapters in the Septuagint, viz. Genesis 2, Isaiah 1 and Proverbs 6.⁷⁶ Van der Louw continues to apply his experience as Bible translator and consultant to clarify the concrete practicalities of the Septuagint translation process.

The same year witnessed an expansion of Septuagint Isaiah studies made possible by a research grant of the Dutch Organization for Scientific Research (NWO). Whereas earlier studies on the Old Greek version of Isaiah had been rather selective in its choice of passages, this project aimed to describe more fully the different aspects of the Greek version on the basis of the pioneer work of Joseph Ziegler.⁷⁷ Ziegler had addressed the issues of the coherence and unity of the Greek Isaiah, its pluses and minuses (*vis-à-vis* MT), the metaphorical language employed by the Greek translator, the relation between the Greek Isaiah and other Greek translations of biblical books and finally the relations between the Greek vocabulary of Isaiah and contemporary documents from Hellenistic Egypt, i.e. the documentary papyri, ostraca and inscriptions.

Mirjam van der Vorm-Croughs (born 1978) investigated all the pluses and minuses and classified them into such categories as “explicitation,” “implicitation,” “double translation,” “condensation,” “anaphoric translation,” “rearrangement,” etc. Only in a very few cases did she conclude that the Greek translation reflects a different Hebrew *Vorlage*, whereas the majority of the pluses and minuses follow well-established patterns. Her discussion now supersedes that of Ziegler not only in terms of comprehensiveness of examples, but also in terms of careful discussion of each of these quantitative variants. She also explored the hitherto neglected aspects of stylistics in the Septuagint of Isaiah.

My own post-doctoral research focused on the relation between the Greek vocabulary of Isaiah and the documentary papyri from Hellenistic and early Roman Egypt. Although the need of a study of Septuagint vocabulary in the light of these unique contemporary documents is well acknowledged in the

⁷⁵ Van der Louw, *Transformations*, 47 (57).

⁷⁶ See also his study “Translator’s Competence and Intention in LXX-Joshua 2,” in *The Land of Israel in Bible, History and Theology*, ed. Van Ruiten and De Vos, 3-18.

⁷⁷ Joseph Ziegler, *Untersuchungen zur Septuaginta des Buches Isaías*, ATA XII/3 (Münster: Aschendorff, 1934).

field,⁷⁸ it was not until digital tools became available that such a study became within the reach of Septuagint scholars.⁷⁹ My studies helped me to establish the meaning of obscure or contested words in the Septuagint of Isaiah,⁸⁰ but also to assess the question of the relation between the Greek Isaiah and the other Greek translations, one of the chapters in Ziegler's work.⁸¹ On the basis of these documents I found a historical person who might fit the profile of the Greek translator of Joshua.⁸² Furthermore, these documents are highly valuable in assessing thorny questions of theology in the Septuagint.⁸³ In more recent studies I applied such a contextual approach to the study of Symmachus⁸⁴ and the geography of the Septuagint.⁸⁵

⁷⁸ See e.g. John A.L. Lee, *A Lexical Study of the Septuagint Version of the Septuagint*, SBLSCS 14 (Chico: Scholars, 1983).

⁷⁹ Thus e.g. the Thesaurus Linguae Graeca (<http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/index.php>), the Duke Databank of Documentary Papyri (www.papyri.info) and the Packard Humanities Institute for Greek Epigraphy (<http://epigraphy.packhum.org/>).

⁸⁰ Michaël N. van der Meer, "Trendy Translations in the Septuagint of Isaiah: A Study of the Vocabulary of the Greek Isaiah 3:18-23 in the Light of Contemporary Sources," in *Die Septuaginta -Texte, Kontexte, Lebenswelten*, ed. Karrer, Kraus, 581-596; id., "Bridge over Troubled Waters? The γέφυρα in the Old Greek of Isaiah of Isaiah 37:25 and Contemporary Greek Sources," in *XIII Congress of the IOSCS, Ljubljana, 2007*, ed. Melvin K.H. Peters, SBLSCS 55 (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2008), 305-324.

⁸¹ Id., "The Question of the Literary Dependence of the Greek Isaiah upon the Greek Psalter Revisited," in *Die Septuaginta-Texte, Theologien, Einflüsse*, ed. Kraus, Karrer and Meiser, 575-614.

⁸² Id., "Provenance, Profile and Purpose of the Greek Joshua," in *XII Congress*, ed. Peters, 55-80.

⁸³ Id., "Problems and Perspectives in Septuagint Lexicography. The Case of Non-Compliance (ἀπειθέω)," in *Septuagint Vocabulary. Pre-History, Usage, Reception*, ed. Jan Joosten and Eberhard Bons, SBLSCS 58 (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2011), 65-86; idem, "Anthropology in the Ancient Greek Versions of Genesis 2," in *Dust of the Ground and Breath of Life (Gen 2:7): The Problem of a Dualistic Anthropology in Early Judaism and Christianity*, ed. Geurt-Henk van Kooten, Jacques T.A.G.M. van Ruiten, TBN 20 (Leiden: Brill, 2016), 36-57; id., "The Greek Translators of the Pentateuch and the Epicureans," in *Torah and Tradition. Papers Read at the Sixteenth Joint Meeting of the Society for Old Testament Study and the Oudtestamentisch Werkgezelschap, Edinburgh, 2015*, ed. Hans Barstad and Klaas Spronk, OtSt 70 (Leiden: Brill, 2017), 176-200.

⁸⁴ Id., "Symmachus, the Septuagint and the Sages: An Examination of the References to Sumkhos ben Joseph in the Mishnah, Tosefta and Talmudim," in *Septuagint, Sages and Scripture: Studies in Honour of Johann Cook*, ed. Randall X. Gauthier, Gideon R. Kotzé, Gert J. Steyn, eds., VTSup 172 (Leiden: Brill, 2016), 366-355, with references to my older contributions.

⁸⁵ Id., "Galilee in the Septuagint. Topography and Textual Criticism of Joshua 19:10-39," in Siegfried Kreuzer and Martin Meiser, eds., *Die Septuaginta-Orte und Intentionen. Wuppertal, 24.-27. Juli 2014*, ed. Siegfried Kreuzer, Martin Meiser, WUNT 361 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016), 186-214, with references to my older contributions.

In 2008 during a small conference on the Septuagint of Isaiah some of the results of the project were shared with specialists on the Old Greek of Isaiah from abroad: David Baer (Overseas council, USA), Alain Le Boulluec (Paris), Philippe Le Moigne (Montpellier), Rodrigo de Sousa (São Paulo), Ronald Troxel (Wisconsin-Madison) and Florian Wilk (Göttingen).⁸⁶ Around that time two scholars from both America's had joined the Leiden ranks. Wilson de Angelo Cunha (born 1980) studied the problems and presuppositions related to the analysis of the variants between the MT and LXX of Isa 24:1-26:6 and offers a methodological trajectory for the study of the Old Greek of Isaiah.⁸⁷ Finally Ben Austin (born 1982) took up the question of the handling of metaphors by the Greek translator of Isaiah, also one of the issues explored preliminarily by Ziegler.⁸⁸ Austin analyzed the way the translator dealt with plant metaphors and the freedom the translator took to interpret these metaphors. Austin found interesting parallels to the Targum of Isaiah.

In the meantime, the longstanding contacts between the Septuagint scholars of Leiden and Stellenbosch, South-Africa, had resulted into a joint study of the provenance of Greek versions of the Pentateuch, Proverbs, Job and Isaiah.⁸⁹ Van der Kooij examined the much neglected role of the high priest in the production of the Greek Pentateuch, as well as the Leontopolis setting of the Greek Isaiah. Johann Cook revisited the question of the presumed identity of the Greek translators of Job and Proverbs and the provenance of these two wisdom books (Alexandria for the Old Greek Job and Jerusalem for the Old Greek Proverbs). Over the years Van der Kooij developed his own paradigm for assessing ancient translations of prophetic texts.⁹⁰ Their production has not so much to do with modern egalitarian concepts of translators working for international organizations, but rather with elite Second Temple priestly-scholarly

⁸⁶ Arie van der Kooij and Michaël N. van der Meer, eds., *The Old Greek of Isaiah: Issues and Perspectives. Papers Read at the Conference on the Septuagint of Isaiah, held in Leiden 10-11 April 2008*, CBET 55 (Leuven: Peeters, 2010).

⁸⁷ Wilson de Angelo Cunha, *LXX Isaiah 24:1-26:6 as Interpretation and Translation. A Methodological Discussion*, PhD diss., Leiden University, 2012, revised edition in SBLSCS 62 (Atlanta: SBL, 2014).

⁸⁸ Benjamin M. Austin, *The Old Greek of Isaiah: An Analysis of Its Translation of Plant Metaphors*, PhD diss. Leiden University, 2014.

⁸⁹ Johann Cook and Arie van der Kooij, *Law, Prophets, and Wisdom. On the Provenance of Translators and Their Books in the Septuagint Version*, CBET 68 (Leuven: Peeters, 2012).

⁹⁰ The term "paradigm" resonates the term used by Albert Pietersma, Cameron Boyd-Taylor and other North American scholars to assess the literalistic character of the majority of Septuagintal books, see e.g. Cameron Boyd-Taylor, *Reading Between the Lines. The Interlinear Paradigm for Septuagint Studies*, Biblical Tools and Studies 8 (Leuven: Peeters, 2011).

circles, who, unlike lesser circles of scribes to whom Ben Sira belonged, considered themselves to be authorized to explain and apply the ancient oracles.⁹¹

4. Research tools

Much Septuagint research in Leiden and elsewhere in the Netherlands has thus been devoted to the study of the exegesis, hermeneutics, historical context, geographical and intellectual context and identity of the Greek translators of the various books of the Septuagint. In addition, three major Septuagint reference works have been produced in the Netherlands over the past decades. Whereas many scholars over the past decades have discussed the need and problems of both a lexicon and syntax of Septuagint Greek, Takamitsu Muraoka (born 1938, professor of Hebrew and Aramaic at Leiden University from 1991 until 2003) almost single-handedly managed to accomplish these reference works on top of his numerous grammatical reference works for Classical Hebrew, Aramaic and Syriac.⁹² The Septuagint lexicon had a long history and was finally published by Muraoka in three stages: first on the Dodekapropheton alone (1993), later including the Pentateuch (2002) and finally the whole of the Septuagint corpus (2009).⁹³ This Leiden lexicon provides definitions of the Greek words based on their literary context whereas its Leuven counterpart produced by Johan Lust, Erik Eynikel and Katrin Hauspie (1992/2003) pays specific attention to the underlying Hebrew text.⁹⁴ Once the lexicon was completed, Muraoka produced a voluminous syntax to the Septuagint, which was published only very recently (2016).⁹⁵ Alongside the lexicon a Greek-Hebrew/Aramaic supplement to the Septuagint Concordance of Hatch and

⁹¹ See besides the articles mentioned in previous footnotes: Arie van der Kooij, “‘Do You Understand what You Are Reading’ (Acts 8:30) On Septuagint Hermeneutics and the Book of Isaiah,” in *Die Septuaginta-Orte und Intentionen*, 5. Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D). Wuppertal 24.-27. Juli 2014, ed. Siegfried Kreuzer, Martin Meiser, Marcus Sigismund, Martin Karrer, Wolfgang Kraus, WUNT 361 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016), 655-68; id., “Scholars and Officials in Early Judaism: The *Sôfer* of Jesus Ben Sira,” in *Septuagint, Sages, and Scripture*, ed. Gauthier, Kotzé, Steyn, 190-204.

⁹² See https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Takamitsu_Muraoka.

⁹³ Takamitsu Muraoka, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint* (Leuven: Peeters, 2009).

⁹⁴ Johan Lust, Erik Eynikel, Katrin Hauspie, *Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1992; second revised edition 2003).

⁹⁵ Takamitsu Muraoka, *A syntax of Septuagint Greek* (Leuven: Peeters, 2016).

Redpath was published which is equally an indispensable tool for Septuagint research.⁹⁶

5. Concluding remarks

It is not easy to summarize Septuagint research in the Netherlands, even more so to draw some general conclusions. What strikes me is both the individual and international character of Septuagint scholarship in Holland. Much work has been done by individuals instead of well-established Septuaginta institutes (e.g. in Göttingen, Langley-Canada, Leuven, Helsinki). The scholars often came from abroad (France in the case of Scaliger or Japan in the case of Muraoka) or emigrated from the Netherlands to Canada (Wevers, Pietersma) or Jerusalem (Seeligmann, Tov). Hence, it remains difficult to speak of a specific Dutch style of Septuagint research, although the hermeneutical approach which views the Septuagint as part of the reception history of the Hebrew Bible, rather than its textual prehistory has a long tradition in the Netherlands (De Boer, Seeligmann, Van der Kooij). Perhaps this paradigm for Septuagint studies will remain a helpful counterpart and corrective to the interlinear paradigm which focusses primarily on the very literal Septuagintal translations. The decisions of the board of Leiden University over the past decade to discontinue the chair of Old Testament and downscale the Theological Faculty drastically to a small institute for Religious Studies does not seem very favorable for Septuagint studies in the Netherlands. Nevertheless, the small scale and international outlook of Septuagint studies may also provide some guarantees that this research will continue somehow in this country.

MICHAËL N. VAN DER MEER
Protestant Theological University
Amsterdam, The Netherlands
m.n.van.der.meer.6884@gmail.com

⁹⁶ Takamitsu Muraoka, *A Greek ~ Hebrew/Aramaic Two-Way Index to the Septuagint* (Leuven: Peeters, 2010), superseding his earlier *Hebrew/Aramaic Index to the Septuagint. Keyed to the Hatch-Redpath Concordance* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1998).

Septuagint Studies in Poland:

Recent Trends and Current Status

KRZYSZTOF MIELCAREK

Biblical research on the Septuagint and cognate studies in Poland does not have such a long and fruitful history as those in Germany, Great Britain, France or other Western countries. Nevertheless, Polish scholars have made some significant contributions to the field. In the last decades of the XX. century some important studies have appeared, and the XXI. century is proving especially productive. This presentation is divided into eight sections concerning particular fields of research or categories of published works, treating each of the following topics in turn: (1) tools; (2) translations; (3) papers on historical perspectives of the LXX; (4) general theological or philosophical approach; (5) introductions; (6) periodicals; (7) monographs; and finally (8) a general overview¹ of Polish contributions to this field of scholarship.

1. Tools

Polish scholarship does not have biblical tools dedicated specifically to the LXX, except some partial studies. In 2013 Prof. Michał Wojciechowski published an interlinear translation of deuterocanonical books², including grammatical notes and a list of basic forms. The volume is a very useful tool for studying the Greek books included.

One can also mention a few biblical commentaries devoted to books belonging to the Greek Bible and being part of the new Polish series of commentaries. Once again, the scholar M. Wojciechowski from Olsztyn has managed

¹ A reader interested in a complete Polish bibliography on the matter is invited to look for my paper published in *The Biblical Annals*: www.biblicalannals.eu.

² M. Wojciechowski, *Grecko-polski Stary Testament. Księgi greckie* (Warszawa 2008, pp. 818).

to prepare two important studies of the *Book of Tobit*³ and of the *Book of Baruch*⁴.

The third commentary to the *Book of Wisdom* was issued by the best specialist of the wisdom literature of an older generation of Polish biblical scholarship, Rev. Prof. Bogdan Poniży from Poznań⁵. The remaining books are still to be published in the series.

Last but not least, some years ago a group of younger scholars interested in Septuagint studies launched a project of preparing an introduction to the Septuagint on an academic level, in cooperation with the Benedictine monastery near Cracow. This effort unfortunately had to be suspended, but hopefully the idea will be taken up again in the near future.

2. Translations

Polish scholars have managed to prepare some important translations, both of books of the Greek Bible and also of some important texts connected with Septuagint studies. The first substantial work appeared in 1996 when Rev. Prof. Antoni Tronina published his translation of the Psalter from the Septuagint.⁶ This well-wrought translation was supplied with short introduction and brief annotations via the footnotes.

Particularly active in the field of translation is, once again, Prof. Michał Wojciechowski. In 2001 his translation of apocryphal books from the LXX was published. It covered the *Third and Fourth Books of Maccabees*, the so-called *Third Book of Esdras*, *Psalm 151* and the *Prayer of Manasseh*⁷. He accompanied his texts with a short introduction to each book, bibliography and many helpful footnotes providing relevant explanations. A year later he published his translation of the *Letter of Aristeas*⁸, and in 2013, as mentioned, he translated the deuterocanonical books⁹. He has also managed to prepare two other important translations of the *Book of Tobit* and of the *Book of Baruch*, just as Prof. B. Poniży produced his translation of the *Book of Wisdom*¹⁰. These

³ Idem, *Księga Tobiasza czyli Tobita*, NKB ST XII (Częstochowa 2005, pp. 218).

⁴ Idem, *Księga Barucha*, NKB ST XXIV/2 (Częstochowa 2016, pp. 167).

⁵ B. Poniży, *Księga Mądrości*, NKB ST XX (Częstochowa 2012, pp. 552).

⁶ *Psalterz Biblii greckiej* (Lublin 1996, pp. 272).

⁷ M. Wojciechowski, *Apokryfy z Biblii greckiej. 3 i 4 Księga Machabejska, 3 Księga Ezdrasza oraz Psalm 151 i Modlitwa Manassesza*, RSB 8 (Warszawa 2001, pp. 328).

⁸ „List Pseudo-Arysteasa”, *STV* 40/1 (2002), 121-167.

⁹ Idem, *Grecko-polski Stary Testament. Księgi greckie* (Warszawa 2008, pp. 818).

¹⁰ See the notes above.

last three translations are integral parts of a new professional biblical commentary series¹¹.

However, the most extensive, indeed epoch-making, translation was done by Rev. Prof. Remigiusz Popowski SDB. This specialist of classical Greek from the John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin managed to prepare the very first Polish translation of the entire Septuagint¹². R. Popowski has been a renowned specialist of *koine* Greek for the last forty years. Together with M. Wojciechowski he had already prepared an interlinear edition of the New Testament (1993)¹³ and a year later, working alone, issued a Polish-Greek Dictionary of the New Testament (1994)¹⁴.

In his LXX translation Popowski used Rahlfs' 2006 critical edition updated by Hanhart. Hence his work covers 53 writings of the Septuagint. His translation technique follows the model of ancient writers; thus he consistently reproduces the specific style of the Septuagint's authors and carefully seeks a single Polish equivalent for each important Greek term in the text. Of great value also are his short introductions to each of the books and his notes appearing below the main text. One can only look with awe at the great accomplishment of this one man, having produced the sort of work usually hammered out by an entire team of scholars.

3. Studies of the historical context

The history of the Septuagint has been treated in some articles and general introductions incorporated into broader studies: Rev. J. Frankowski already in early 1970s presented the history of the Letter of Aristeas¹⁵. A. Żurek, gave a short sketch of the historical road from the Septuagint to Vulgate¹⁶. Rev. Prof. J. Warzecha provided some information about the Alexandrian diaspora¹⁷, as

¹¹ *New Biblical Commentary*; Częstochowa 2008–; chief ed. A. Paciorek.

¹² *Septuaginta, czyli Biblia Starego Testamentu wraz z księgami deuterokanonicznymi i apokryfami* (Warszawa 2013).

¹³ *Grecko-polski Nowy Testament* (Warszawa 1993, pp. XLVI + 1236).

¹⁴ R. Popowski, *Wielki słownik grecko-polski Nowego Testamentu* (Warszawa 1994, pp. XVIII + 938).

¹⁵ „List Arysteasa czyli legenda o powstaniu Septuaginty”, *RBL* 25/1 (1972), 12-22.

¹⁶ „Od Septuaginty do Wulgaty – Biblia w Kościele pierwszych wieków”, *TST* 11 (1992), 99-107.

¹⁷ „Z dziejów diaspory aleksandryjskiej”. *Pieśniami dla mnie Twoje przykazania*, ed. W. Chrostowski (Warszawa 2003), 339-372.

did K. Pilarczyk¹⁸ and P. Piwowarczyk¹⁹. A somewhat more general view on the LXX in the context of Hellenistic Judaism was given by K. Mielcarek²⁰. However, none of the scholars mentioned above seem to have focused on the historical aspect of the LXX.

4. General theological or philosophical approaches

A few articles have concentrated on general theological or philosophical discussions over the role of the Septuagint. In 1984 E. Stanula studied the value of the Septuagint as viewed by Hilary de Poitiers. About fifteen years later W. Szczerba explored the role of the LXX in providing Christian philosophical terminology. In his two articles Szczerba presented a broadly recognised conviction about strong linkages between the LXX, Philo, and Christian theologians of the patristic era²¹.

Then two other articles appeared almost simultaneously (2001) dealing with the issue of the inspiration of the Greek Bible text (W. Chrostowski²², K. Mielcarek²³). Even though the approaches of the two scholars to the problem seem very much alike, their conclusions are slightly different. Rev. Chrostowski strongly affirms the inspiration of the LXX, while Mielcarek, agreeing generally with such a statement, leaves the question open to further discussion.

5. Introductions

As mentioned above, there is no proper, comprehensive introduction to the Septuagint available in Polish. However, some short treatments, either general studies or partial, book-by-book introductory studies have been offered in the form of articles. In the first group four names are worthy of mention:

¹⁸ „Apokryfy judaistyczne – obce elementy w religijnej tradycji żydowskiej?” *StJ* 11/1 (2008), 31-42.

¹⁹ „Żydzi egipscy wobec władców ptolemejskich. Rekonesans źródłowy”, *StJ* 10/2 (2007), 215-234.

²⁰ „Biblia grecka i jej wpływ na judaizm hellenistyczny”, *SNT* 4 (2009), 27-35.

²¹ „Język Septuaginty jako narzędzie ufilozoficznienia Biblii”, *AcUWr(F)* 36 (1999) 279-293; The language of the Septuagint as a window on the philosophy of the Hebrew Bible, *LaC* 8 (1998), 67-85.

²² Wokół kwestii natchnienia Biblii Greckiej, *Żywe jest słowo Boże i skuteczne* (ed. W. Chrostowski; Warszawa 2001), 89-110.

²³ Ku nowej koncepcji natchnienia LXX. *RTK* 48/1 (2001), 5-25.

M. Wojciechowski, W. Chrostowski, K. Mielcarek and S. Jędrzejewski. Among the second group, B. Strzałkowska has proven to be most effective of a younger generation of scholars (Genesis, Joshua, Song of Songs, Hosea); however M. Wojciechowski (Tobit, [3 Mch, 4 Mch, 3 Esdr – within his book]) and B. Poniży (Wisdom) have their merits as well.

One can also mention the several encyclopaedia entries concerning the Septuagint and related topics, most of which were prepared by the biblical scholars from the Catholic University of Lublin²⁴.

6. Periodicals

In 2017 the Biblical Institute of the Theological Faculty of Cardinal Wyszyński University launched an important project associated with the Septuagint. Biblical scholars from Warsaw have just started a new biblical biannual named *Studia Biblica Graeca*. As the title suggests, the journal will cover the results of research concerning especially the Septuagint, as well as the New Testament, Church Father studies, and Jewish Hellenistic texts. It is the ambition of the founders to stimulate international dialogue through the pages of their periodical, and they thus invite scholars from abroad to join in an intellectual exchange. It is crucial to the editorial board not only to present actual original studies of the Greek Bible issues, but also to open up an exchange of ideas and experiences in contemporary septuagintal research.

Studia Biblica Graeca will have four separate sections: philological and translational studies; historical studies and studies concerning Greek Jewish and early-Christian literature; theological and hermeneutical studies; and bibliographical offerings (reviews, reports, bibliographies).

7. Monographs

A detailed description of all the books devoted to the LXX that were issued in Poland is impossible here. Thus, the reader should consult the bibliography appended to the text as published in the Biblical Annals²⁵. Most of them have been produced by scholars already mentioned above (Poniży, Chrostowski, Wojciechowski, Mielcarek, Strzałkowska), but some names are new (Linke, Kowalik, Dymitrów, Popko). The works usually treat directly specific issues in books like Wisdom, Tobit, Ezekiel, Genesis, Sirach, Job or Jeremiah. Some,

²⁴ See *Encyklopedia Katolicka*, Vol. 1–20, Lublin 1973–2014.

²⁵ See the note no 1.

however, built a bridge toward the New Testament – Hierosolyma-Jerusalem problem in the LXX and in the Lukan work (Mielcarek).

Just a short description of two of them will be given, both written by young Polish scholars. The first one is a doctoral dissertation defended by Dominican friar Fr. Łukasz Popko at the École Biblique et Archéologique Française in Jerusalem in January 2014. The book: *Marriage Metaphor in Jer 2:1-4:2. A Diachronic Study Based on the MT and LXX*, is a comparative study of Jer 2:1-4:2 according to the LXX and MT.

According to the author both the Hebrew and Greek texts are products of conscious creative reworking rather than a sequence of errors of inattentive scribes. The probable development of the actual MT form of Jer 2:1-4:2 was from a primitive poem (exilic; hostile to Egypt; Judean or Babylonian perspective [2:4-37]); rewritten at the time of return (3:1-5.12-13.19-4:2), and again after the Temple reconstruction regarding the ideal future (3:14-18). In the last two stages the short prologue about the nation's faithful youth was added (2:2-3) along with the two wives' allegory (3:6-11). The last insertion, according to the author, gave the whole narrative a new context exchanging a rebellious daughter for an adulterous wife.

The second book is the newest fruit of Polish scholarship concerning the LXX, which constitutes a key element in B. Strzałkowska's post Ph.D. researches: *Księga Przysłów 1-9 w Septuagincie. Analiza „dodatków” i „braków” w zestawieniu z Tekstem Masoreckim w świetle starożytnych świadectw tekstualnych* [The Book of Proverbs 1-9 in the Septuagint. The Analysis of “additions” and “gaps” juxtaposed with TM in the light of the Ancient Textual Witnesses] (RSB 48) (Warszawa 2017), pp. 666.

Strzałkowska claims that the Greek text of Proverbs is a very important witness for understanding and interpretation of the BH, since it is full of Hellenistic philosophical and cultural allusions that have fundamentally changed its original character.

Strzałkowska set two goals for her study: ascertaining of the primordial Prov^{LXX} (OG) through textual criticism; and achieving a proper understanding of the Greek text of Proverbs in comparison to BH, i.e. determining its character, translation technique and theology. Having studied the phenomena of additions and gaps, she is convinced that these were caused either by intentional changes on the part of the translator (and thus could be treated as a kind of Prov^{LXX} theology) or, in rare cases, by the errors of copyists. The still later intrusions of redactors say nothing about the original theology of Prov^{LXX}; if anything, such revisions tended to draw the Greek text closer to BH. The major

differences between Prov^{BH} and Prov^{LXX} are the result of the alternative Hebrew text (Vorlage), but some minor differences or apparent gaps are in fact a consequence of translation technique which was “ad sensum” in nature rather than literary.

8. General overview

The contribution of Polish scholars to worldwide research on the LXX over the past few decades is altogether 215 different texts. Among these there are 175 scientific papers (including 15 books), 22 popular articles and 18 reviews. Among Polish authors involved in septuagintal studies, one can identify a group of at least ten people who not only publish regularly on the subject but are fully focused on such studies. The others are involved sporadically or tangentially.

Unfortunately, only a few of the books and articles mentioned above have been published in the conference languages; hence most remain inaccessible to the wider world of scholarship.

KRZYSZTOF MIELCAREK
Institute of Biblical Studies
John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin
Lublin, Poland
krzysztof.mielcarek@kul.pl

Septuagintaforschung in Schweden, Dänemark und Norwegen

Eine kurze Übersicht

MOGENS MÜLLER

Wie es an den Artikeln in repräsentativen Nachschlagewerken zu erkennen ist, wurde die Septuaginta bis in die letzten Jahrzehnte des 20. Jahrhunderts vor allem als Hilfsmittel zur Herstellung des ältesten hebräischen Textes des Alten Testaments betrachtet.¹

Eine Ausnahme ist der Lunder Alttestamentler Gillis Gerleman (1912-1993), der 1946 und 1956 drei kleinere Abhandlungen unter der zusammenfassenden Überschrift *Studies in the Septuagint* herausgab.

Die erste Studie war: Das Buch Hiob.² Im Vorwort erklärt Gerleman, dass das Verhältnis der Septuaginta zum Originaltext nicht nur ein philologisches, sondern auch ein zivilisations- und religionsgeschichtliches Problem darstellt. „The Septuagint must be considered as representing a new stage in the understanding and shaping of the Old Testament, namely that of Hellenistic Judaism.”³ Die zweite Studie war: Die Chronikbücher.⁴ Gerleman kommt hier zum

¹ Siehe A. Bentzen, „Septuaginta”. *Illustreret Religionsleksikon* III. N-Ø (Kopenhagen: Skandinavisk Bogforlag 1950), 284; vgl. ders. *Introduction to the Old Testament* I-II (Copenhagen: G.E.C. Gad Publisher 1948, ⁵1959), 75-86; H. Riesenfeld, „Septuaginta”. *Svenskt Bibliskt Uppslagsverk* II. M-Ö (Stockholm: Nordiska Uppslagsböcker, 1952, ²1963), 910-913; G. Gerleman, „Septuaginta (LXX)”, *Nordisk Teologisk Leksikon for Kirke og Skole* (in Schweden unter dem Titel *Nordisk Teologisk Uppslagsbok* herausgegeben) III. P-Ö (Lund: C.W.K. Gleerups Förlag/Kopenhagen: Ejnar Munksgaard 1957), 524-528; S.M. Søndergaard, „Septuaginta”. *Gads Danske Bibelleksikon* III. P-Å (København: Gads Forlag, 1965, 2. Aufl. in drei Bänden 1982), Bd. 3, Sp. 323-325. Erst in der neuen Ausgabe, *Gads Bibelleksikon* II (Kopenhagen: Gad 1998) 270-271, änderte sich dieses Bild.

² *Book of Job*, LUÅ N.F. Avd 1 Bd 43 Nr 2 (Lund: C.K.W. Gleerup 1946), 86 S.

³ *Book of Job*, 3. Konkludierend heisst es denn auch (75), dass “the Greek Book of Job is a genuine Hellenistic work, created and familiar to circles comparatively foreign to all exclusively Jewish line of thought.”

⁴ *Chronicles*, LUÅ N.F. Avd. 1. Bd 43. Nr 3 (1946), 46 S.

Schluss, dass Paralipomena eine unmissverständliche ägyptische Färbung hat und Verhältnisse am ptolemäischen Hof im 2. Jh. v.Chr. reflektiert. Die dritte Studie behandelt die Sprüche.⁵ Auch hier sieht der Verfasser eine deutliche Tendenz der Übersetzung in Richtung Offenheit gegenüber der hellenistischen Kultur: „Its anthropocentric and humanizing piety, its freedom from legalistic tendencies, its pedagogical-moralizing interest, all these things do not lead up to Judaism, but to the Greek world“ (51).

Der nächste zu nennende Beitrag ist die Dissertation des Alttestamentlers in Uppsala, Staffan Olofsson, *God is my Rock. A Study of Translation Technique and Theological Exegesis in the Septuagint*, revidiert und als Buch herausgegeben 1990. Eine Einführung in die Problematik liefert Olofsson in dem begleitenden Band, *The LXX Version. A Guide to the Translation Technique of the Septuagint*, mit einer Zusammenfassung der diesbezüglichen Literatur.⁶ Der Verfasser nimmt wahr, dass die Septuaginta, obwohl von Juden und für Juden gemacht, in einigem Ausmaß von der jüdisch-hellenistischen Kultur beeinflusst ist; d.h. sie gehört nicht nur in eine andere Zeit als die Biblia Hebraica, sondern sie entstand auch in einer ganz anderen Kultur und einer anderen Begriffswelt. Olofsson's Untersuchung gilt der Wiedergabe der verschiedenen Gottesbezeichnungen und -Prädikate, besonders dort, wo das sonst ungewöhnliche Phänomen der Vermeidung einer wörtlichen Wiedergabe zu beobachten ist. Es geht hier nicht so sehr um einen Antianthropomorphismus, sondern eher um Einfluss von poetischer Sprache und dem Sprachgebrauch der Synagoge. Dennoch – wie es abschließend heißt: „Two kinds of theological motives may have been involved in the rendering of divine names and epithets under discussion. One is based on the similarity of identity with archaic or contemporary titles of divine beings outside the religion of Israel, which could create doubts regarding the exclusivity of Yahweh, the other is based on a tendency to emphasize the transcendence, and thereby free him from associations with material objects. These motives are understandable in the religio-cultural situation of Jewry in the diaspora with its strong missionary ambitions, and

⁵ *Proverbs*, LUÅ N.F. Avd. 1, Bd 52, Nr 3 (1956), 64 S. Als Vorarbeit gilt hier „The Septuaginta Proverbs as a Hellenistic document“, *OTS* 8 (1950), 15-27, auch auf Swedish erschienen in *STK* 26 (1950), 222-232.

⁶ Die zwei Bände sind in CB.OT, als Nr. 30 bzw. 31 erschienen (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell 1990), 208 S. bzw. 105 S.

also compatible with a religious development within Jewish religion in the last centuries B.C.”⁷

Auch aus Schweden kommt noch eine weitere, für die Septuaginta-Forschung relevante Untersuchung, nämlich *The Greek of the Ancient Synagogue: An Investigation on the Greek of the Septuagint, Pseudepigrapha and the New Testament* von Georg Walser aus Göteborg.⁸ In dieser Untersuchung versucht Walser “to test the hypothesis that there existed a peculiar variety of Greek which was used for certain purposes by Jewish and Christian writers in the context of the synagogue.” Er analysiert die Benutzung von Partizipien, Konjugationen und Partikeln im Pentateuch und vergleicht sie mit anderen Texten. Der Ertrag ist, dass eine spezielle Gruppe von Texten Affinitäten zum Griechischen des Pentateuchs aufweisen. Dies ermöglicht die Annahme, dass dieser Übersetzung ein besonderes Griechisch zu Grunde liegt, das Walser als Synagogen-Griechisch bezeichnet, “used for particular genre, intended for a similar audience, and dealing with the same subject-matter” (186). Das ist das Griechisch, das wir auch in den übrigen Büchern der Septuaginta, in den Pseudepigraphen, und im Neuen Testament finden. Eine revidierte Ausgabe ist inzwischen als Kommentar zu Jeremia in der Septuagint Commentary Series erschienen: *Jeremiah: A Commentary based on Ieremias in Codex Vaticanus*.⁹

Dass die Septuaginta als eine interpretierende Rezeption, also teilweise auch als eine selbständige hellenistische Ausgabe der jüdischen heiligen Bücher, aufzufassen ist, hat im Verfasser dieses Berichtes, dem Kopenhagener Neutestamentler Mogens Müller einen Fürsprecher gefunden. Die Fixierung auf den hebräischen *Grundtext*, die bis auf die Reformation zurückgeht, ist heute, nicht zuletzt dank der Textfunde aus Qumran, verlassen. Der Umstand, dass die neutestamentlichen Autoren vorerst die alten griechischen Übersetzungen benutzten, gab der Septuaginta ihre Position als die erste Bibel der Kirche zurück. Diese Ansicht verteidigte Müller zuerst in einer Reihe von Auf-

⁷ CB.OT 31 (1990) 151. Ein früherer Aufsatz ist “The Translation of Jer 2,18 in the Septuagint. Methodological, Linguistic and Theological Aspects“, *SJOT* 2 (1988), 169-200, ein späterer “Consistency as a Translation Technique“, *SJOT* 6 (1992), 14-30.

⁸ *Studia Graeca et Latina Lundensia* 8 (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International, 2001) XXVI + 198 S. Siehe auch den Aufsatz “Die Wortfolge der Septuaginta“, in M. Karrer und W. Kraus (Hg.), *Die Septuaginta – Texte, Kontexte, Lebenswelten*, WUNT 219 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 258-266.

⁹ (Leiden: Brill, 2012), XI + 496 S.

sätze, die dann in 1996 in *The First Bible of the Church. A Plea for the Septuagint* zusammengefasst wurden.¹⁰ Hier und auch in einer Reihe von weiteren Aufsätzen¹¹ geht es dem Verfasser vor allem um die Rezeptionsgeschichte und die theologische Bedeutung der Septuaginta. Darüber hinaus gibt es kaum weitere Forschungen zur Septuaginta in Dänemark.¹²

Letztlich soll auch ein norwegischer Septuaginta-Forscher genannt werden, nämlich Gunnar Magnus Eidsvåg. Seine Doktorarbeit von 2011 in Stavanger trug den Titel *The Septuagint of Zechariah. A Study of LXX-Zechariah as Translation and Interpretation*;¹³ sie erschien 2015 in bearbeiteter Gestalt als *The Old Greek Translation of Zechariah*.¹⁴ Die Analyse der Übersetzung zeigt, dass der Übersetzer danach strebte, sowohl wortgetreu zu sein als auch einen verständlichen Text zu liefern. Verschiedene Akzentuierungen in der Wiedergabe deuten auf eine Abfassung in der hasmonäischen Zeit hin, und zwar in Opposition gegen die Oniaden und ihren Tempel in Leontopolis und mit entsprechender Sympathie für Jerusalem. Eidsvåg hat darüber hinaus auch einige Aufsätze zu Septuaginta-Themen veröffentlicht.¹⁵

MOGENS MÜLLER
University of Copenhagen
København, Danmark
mm@teol.ku.dk

¹⁰ JSOTSS 206 / CIS 1 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press 1996) 163 S. Zuvor erschienen als *Kirkens først Bibel. Hebraica sive Graeca veritas* (Kopenhagen: ANIS, 1994), 152 S.

¹¹ Siehe z.B. "Die Septuaginta als Teil des christlichen Kanons", in M. Karrer und W. Kraus (Hg.), *Die Septuaginta – Texte, Kontexte, Lebenswelten*, WUNT 219 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 708-727, und "Biblia semper interpretanda est. The Role of the Septuagint as a Hellenistic Version of the Old Testament", in G. Bonney und R. V. (eds.), *Sophia-Paideia. Sapienza e educazione (Sir1,27)*. FS Don Mario Cimosà, Nuova Biblioteca di Scienze Religiose 34 (Roma: LAS, 2012), 17-31.

¹² Genannt werden soll jedoch ein Aufsatz von Bodil Ejrnæs (Kopenhagen), "Septuagintas rolle i dansk bibeltradition", in N. P. Lemche and M. Müller (Hg.), *Fra dybet*. FS John Strange. Forum for Bibelsk Eksegese 5 (Kopenhagen: Museum Tusculanum, 1994), 20-34.

¹³ Stavanger, School of Mission and Theology, Dissertation Series 11, 356 S.

¹⁴ VTS 170 (Leiden: Brill 2015), xii + 272 S.

¹⁵ Z.B. "The Rendering of Toponyms in the LXX-Minor Prophets: An Indication of Alexandrian Provenance", in: *XIV Congress of the IOSCS, Helsinki, 2010* (Atlanta, GA: SBL Press, 2014), 445-455.

Septuagint Research in South Africa

Some Brief Notes on the Development of Five Fields of Study

GERT J. STEYN

1. Introduction

It was in northern Africa where the first Greek translation of the Torah was made. On the opposite side of the same continent, in southern Africa, these Jewish-Hellenistic translations found their own place in scholarly research during the last century. Similar to ancient Hellenistic Judaism, so did current LXX research spread across the world, sharing many similarities, but also local peculiarities. South African LXX research is closely connected to the international trends and tendencies of research in this relatively new, but rapidly growing field of biblical and cognate studies. However, it lately also shows signs of broader inter-disciplinary studies and of diversification. All in all, South African LXX research prides itself in its own small contribution to the field of international LXX studies.

This brief report intends to organise and present an overview of some of the areas of current research, as well as the prominent places where the LXX is studied, together with the particular roles and contributions made by some individual researchers. It is by no means intended to be an exhaustive and comprehensive study, but rather some brief notes on the origins of South African LXX research.¹ At least five main research areas received considerable attention, namely text-critical studies, exegetical and translation studies, the theology of the LXX, as well as narratological and reader-response studies. A brief survey of each of these will follow, with attention to different researchers and institutions involved.

¹ For a survey of the period 1978-1989 and the importance of LXX studies for NT scholarship, see G.J. Steyn, "Die stand van LXX-navorsing in die RSA (1978-1989) en die belang hiervan vir die NT-wetenskap", *Theologia Evangelica* 23/2 (1990), 7-14. See also P.J. Jordaan and N.P.L. Allen (eds.), "Introduction", in idem., *Construction, Coherence and Connotation in Septuagint, Apocryphal and Cognate Literature in Honour of Johann Cook* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2016), 13-19.

2. Text-critical studies

The origins of South African LXX scholarship are deeply rooted in text-critical studies. The influential work of Emanuel Tov² had been instrumental and impacted on the research of particularly Johann Cook³ (professor for Semitic studies at Stellenbosch University) and Gert J. Steyn⁴ (professor for New Testament Studies at the University of Pretoria), as well as on those of their students. In Stellenbosch, Randall X. Gauthier⁵ and Gideon R. Kotzé⁶ pursued text critical studies on the Psalms and Lamentations under the supervision of Cook, as well as Gert J. Steyn himself with his study on the explicit quotations in *Ad Hebraeos*. In Pretoria, Peter Nagel⁷ and Ronald van der Bergh⁸ encountered on similar studies – particularly text critical studies of LXX quotations in the NT (Acts of the Apostles, Romans and the Corinthian correspondence) – under the supervision of Steyn. Some South Koreans, such as Juwon Kim who continued with Steyn’s initial work on the speeches in the Acts of the Apostles, joined this venture in Pretoria.

Cook’s text critical work had been commended by his peers. In his research history of OT research in South Africa, Jurie le Roux remarked: “Cook differed from his predecessors. He did not focus on the history of the canon, but on the text. He has devoted his scholarly life up to now to textual criticism. Within

² E. Tov, *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research* (Jerusalem Biblical Studies 3; Simor: Tel Aviv, 1981).

³ Johann Cook did his doctoral studies under the supervision of Charles Fencham who, in turn, did his doctoral thesis on the term ἁβύσσου in Gen 1:2.

⁴ Gert J. Steyn completed his PhD in NT during 1994 under the supervision of Cilliers Breytenbach with a study on *Septuagint Quotations in the Context of the Petrine and Pauline Speeches of the Acta Apostolorum* (Kampen: Kok Pharos / Leuven: Peeters Press, 1995). He later also completed a D.Litt. during 2009 in Ancient Studies under the supervision of Johann Cook and Johan Thom, entitled *A Quest for the Assumed Septuagint Vorlage of the Explicit Quotations in Hebrews* and published in 2011 by Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen, in the FRLANT series, volume 235.

⁵ Randall X. Gauthier, *Psalms 38 and 145 of the Old Greek Version* (Leiden: Brill, 2014).

⁶ Gideon R. Kotzé, *The Qumran Manuscripts of Lamentations: A Text-Critical Study* (Leiden: Brill, 2013).

⁷ Peter Nagel, “The Explicit Kyrios and Theos Citations by Paul: An Attempt at Understanding Paul’s Deity Concepts” (Unpublished PhD Thesis, University of Pretoria, 2012).

⁸ Ronald H. van der Bergh, “The Textual Tradition of Explicit Quotations in Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis of the Acts of the Apostles” (PhD Thesis, 2013 – forthcoming publication in ANTF series, Berlin: De Gruyter). Van der Bergh is currently program chair of the Working with Biblical Manuscripts (Textual Criticism) at SBL.

our context his contribution has been great; he has made an exceptional contribution to textual criticism in South Africa as well as abroad; he has made us aware of the importance of different text versions; he has persuaded us to take textual criticism seriously; he has opened our eyes for the theological possibilities of the Septuagint and the Peshitta; he has linked the theology of the Old Testament to textual criticism in a fascinating way and renders an invaluable service with the compilation of a computerised data base.”⁹

Steyn’s work on the LXX *Vorlage* of the NT quotations – dovetailed into studies on the *Vorlagen* of the quotations in Acts 10 and Hebrews 11 and lately also in Philo of Alexandria. In 1986, he firstly became aware of the fact that the area of LXX research was neither dealt with by NT scholars (because the LXX is an OT text), nor by OT scholars (because the LXX was written in Greek not Hebrew) and realized that existing investigations into the hermeneutics of the early Christian writers were still conducted on the basis of the MT whereas the Scriptures of those early Christian writers were actually mainly Greek versions.

Steyn’s continued research in the inter-textual field of LXX and NT studies brought him to the conclusion that an integral methodological flaw in comparative textual studies between the NT quotations and their *Vorlagen*, is that they compared reconstructed and printed text editions with each other, rather than manuscripts with manuscripts.¹² He later proposed the publication of a multi-

⁹ J.H. Le Roux, *A Story of Two Ways: Thirty Years of Old Testament Scholarship in South Africa* (OTE Suppl 2, Verba Vitae: Pretoria, 1993), 79.

¹⁰ See, for instance, G.J. Steyn, “Notes on the Vorlage of the Amos Quotations in Acts,” in Breytenbach, Cilliers & Schröter, Jens (eds.), *Die Apostelgeschichte und die hellenistische Geschichtsschreibung. Festschrift für Eckard Plümacher zu seinem 65. Geburtstag*, Ancient Judaism & Christianity 57. AGAJU (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 59-81.

¹¹ See, for instance, “A Quest for the *Vorlage* of the Song of Moses (Dt 32) Quotations in Hebrews”, *Neotestamentica* 34 (2000), 263-272; idem., “The *Vorlage* of the Melchizedek phrases in Heb 7:1-4”, *Acta Patristica et Byzantina* 13 (2002), 207-223; idem., “A Note on the *Vorlage* of the Citation in Heb 4,4”, *Ekklesiastikos Pharos* 84 (2002), 43-50; idem., “Some observations about the *Vorlage* of Ps 8,5-7 in Heb 2,6-8”, *Verbum et Ecclesia* 24.2 (2003), 493-514; idem., The *Vorlage* of Ps 45:6-7(44:7-8) in Heb 1:8-9. *HTS Theological Studies* 60.3 (2004), 1085-1103; idem., “Notes on Ps 101 (LXX) and Ps 103 (LXX) in Hebrews 1 in the light of evidence from the Dead Sea Scrolls and Papyrus Bodmer XXIV”, *Acta Patristica et Byzantina* 20 (2009), 384-406.

¹² Cf., for instance, G.J. Steyn, “Which LXX are we talking about in New Testament scholarship? Two examples from Hebrews,” in M. Karrer and W. Kraus (eds.), *Die Septuaginta – Texte, Kontexte, Lebenswelten*, WUNT 219 (Tübingen: Mohr, 2008), 297-307.

volume Synopsis as a reference tool for pastors and scholars in this regard.¹³ Through a systematic study of the NT quotations and the quotations by Philo of Alexandria, Steyn's research contributes to studies on the reconstruction of the LXX text.¹⁴

Formalised international networking with peers in this branch of text critical LXX studies, takes shape, for example, through close cooperation of particularly Steyn and Cook on several projects with researchers from the Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D)¹⁵ with regular meetings every second year at the Kirchliche Hochschule Wuppertal-Bethel in Germany since 2006 – contributing to many specialized research publications. Steyn was also officially appointed as a Research Associate at the Kirchliche Hochschule Wuppertal-Bethel in 2011. This South African branch of LXX studies, furthermore, has close connections with LXX scholars at Catholic University in Leuven, Belgium, but also with several other centres of LXX studies, and through the IOSCS and working groups of the SBL.

3. Exegetical and translation studies

Several exegetical and translational studies followed alongside the text critical explorations which took place in Stellenbosch and Pretoria. These were mainly driven, on the one hand, by Johan Cook's involvement in the translation and commentary work of NETS. Especially the LXX Proverbs has been studied

¹³ Cf. G.J. Steyn, "Comparing Manuscripts with Manuscripts. Thoughts on the Compilation of a Synopsis of Textual Variants in the Old Testament Quotations in the New Testament", in M. Karrer, S. Kreuzer and M. Sigismund (eds), *Von der Septuaginta zum Neuen Testament. Textgeschichtliche Erörterungen* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2010), 211 – 226.

¹⁴ Cf., for instance G.J. Steyn, "Two New Testament Papyri on the Quotations in Hebrews and their possible value in the reconstruction of LXX texts," in W. Kraus and M. Karrer (eds.), *Die Septuaginta – Texte, Theologien, Einflüsse*, WUNT 252 (Tübingen: Mohr, 2010), 238-255. See also G.J. Steyn, "Torah Quotations common to Philo, Hebrews, Clements Romanus and Justin Martyr: What is the common denominator?" in C. Breytenbach, J.C. Thom and J. Punt (eds), *The New Testament Interpreted: Essays in Honour of Bernard C. Lategan*, Supplements Novum Testamentum 124 (Leiden: EJ Brill, 2006), 135-151.

¹⁵ Gert J. Steyn's research – and that on Codex Bezae by his student Ronald van der Bergh – received due recognition and was documented and extensively cited by J. De Vries and M. Karrer (eds.), *Textual History and the Reception of Scripture in Early Christianity* SBL.SCS 60 (Atlanta, SBL, 2013).

extensively by Cook from different angles, including its dating,¹⁶ translators,¹⁷ differences with the MT,¹⁸ hellenistic influence,¹⁹ its textual problems,²⁰ text-critical value,²¹ relationship with the Psalms,²² with Job,²³ with Qohelet,²⁴ with Jeremiah,²⁵ with the Law,²⁶ its apocalyptic terminology,²⁷ and theological tendenz.²⁸ The doctoral study of particularly Dirk Büchner²⁹ stands as one example of Septuagintal exegetical studies in Stellenbosch.

¹⁶ See J. Cook, "The Dating of Septuagint Proverbs," *ETHL* 69/4 (1993), 383–99.

¹⁷ J. Cook, "The translator(s) of LXX Proverbs," *TC – a Journal of Biblical Textual Criticism* 7 (2002) 1–50.

¹⁸ J. Cook, "The Greek of Proverbs – evidence of a recensionally deviating Hebrew text?," in S.M. Paul; R.A. Kraft; R.L. Schiffman & W.W. Fields (ed.), *Emanuel. Studies in the Hebrew Bible, Septuagint and Dead Sea Scrolls in honor of Emanuel Tov* (Brill: Leiden-Boston, 2003), 605–18.

¹⁹ See J. Cook, "Hellenistic Influence in the Septuagint Book of Proverbs," in C. Cox (ed.), *VII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies. Leuven 1989*, SBL.SCS 31 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991), 341–53; J. Cook, *The Septuagint of Proverbs – Jewish and/or Hellenistic Proverbs? (concerning the Hellenistic colouring of LXX Proverbs)*, VTS 69 (Leiden: Brill, 1997).

²⁰ J. Cook, "Textual Problems in the Septuagint of Proverbs," *JNSL* 26 (2000), 77–88.

²¹ J. Cook, "The text-critical value of the Septuagint of Proverbs," in R.L. Troxel, K.G. Friebel and D.R. Magary (eds.), *Seeking out the Wisdom of the Ancients. Essays in honor of Michael V. Fox on the occasion of his sixty-fifth birthday* (Eisenbrauns: Winona Lake, 2005) 407–19.

²² J. Cook, "Intertextual Relationships between the Septuagint of Psalms and Proverbs," in R.J.V. Hiebert; C.E. Cox, and P.J. Gentry (ed.), *The Old Greek Psalter: Studies in Honour of Albert Pietersma* (JSOT Supp Ser 332; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001) 218–28.

²³ See J. Cook, "Aspects of the Relationship Between the Septuagint Versions of Proverbs and Job," in B.A. Taylor (ed.), *IX Congress of the International Organisation for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Cambridge 1995* (SBLSCSS 45; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997), 309–28.

²⁴ J. Cook, "Aspects of the Relationship between the Septuagint Versions of Kohelet and Proverbs," in A. Schoors (ed.), *Qohelet in the Context of Wisdom*, BETL 136 (Leuven: Peeters, 1998), 481–92.

²⁵ Cf. J. Cook, "A Comparison of Proverbs and Jeremiah in the Septuagint," *JNSL* 20 (1994), 49–58.

²⁶ See J. Cook, "The Law of Moses in Septuagint Proverbs," *VT* 49 (1999), 448–61; and J. Cook, "The Law in the Septuagint Proverbs," *JNSL* 23/1 (1997), 211–23.

²⁷ Cf. J. Cook, "Apocalyptic terminology in Septuagint Proverbs," *JNSL* 25 (1999), 251–64.

²⁸ J. Cook, "Theological/ideological Tendenz in the Septuagint – LXX Proverbs a case study," in F. García Martínez & M. Vervenne (ed.), *Interpreting Translation. Studies on the LXX and Ezekiel in honour of Johan Lust* (Leuven: University Press, 2005), 65–79.

²⁹ Dirk Büchner, "Septuagint Exodus 12-23 and Mekilta: Examples of Early Jewish Exegesis?" (Unpublished D.Litt. Thesis, Stellenbosch University, 1994). Büchner is currently Professor of Biblical Studies at Trinity Western University in Canada.

On the other hand, broader studies on the role and influence of the LXX in the NT (particularly Luke's gospel and Acts during 1984 to 2000) by Steyn, contributed to the field of exegetical research. Steyn firstly investigated the LXX influence on the language and style of Luke's Gospel for a Masters study in Greek under the supervision of the famous scholar of the NT Semantic Greek Lexicon, Jannie P Louw. He continued with a study on Acts, investigating the LXX quotations in the Petrine and Pauline Speeches in Acts³⁰ with Cilliers Breytenbach (Humboldt University in Berlin) and strongly influenced by Dietrich-Alex Koch (Westfälische Wilhelms University in Münster; (1990-1991). This LXX exegetical research track has been pursued by Annette Potgieter,³¹ for example, as well as by several South Koreans who joined this venture, albeit largely with a broader focus on LXX motifs in the NT. These included, among others, Hyuk-Jung Kwon, Jae-Soon Kim and Young Namgung.

The new Afrikaans translation which is currently in progress by the Bible Society of South Africa also includes the deuterocanonical books. The editorial committee for this section has drawn on the expertise of the South African LXX scholars, which included them as translators and committee members. This project, in turn, has led in recent years to thematic conferences of the LXXSA on the books of the Maccabees and contributions on Ben Sira.

Formalised international networking with peers in this branch of LXX studies, takes shape, for example, through cooperation with researchers from the Catholic University in Leuven, Belgium, but also through the IOSCS and working groups of the SBL.

4. Theology of the LXX

South Africa followed suit regarding the international debate on and efforts to define and to write a "theology of the LXX". This is a relatively recent area of LXX research in South Africa with several ad hoc contributions by local scholars. Cook took the lead in this area and chose to present, for instance, his Presidential address at IOSOT in 2016 on this topic. The general question is currently still largely an epistemological one: Is it indeed possible to formulate a

³⁰ G.J. Steyn, *Septuagint Quotations in the Context of the Petrine and Pauline Speeches of the Acta Apostolorum* (Kampen: Kok Pharos / Leuven: Peeters Press, 1995).

³¹ Annette Potgieter, *Pneuma in the LXX Jeremiah, Baruch and the Epistula Jeremiah compared to John 3:8*, (Unpublished MDiv study, University of Pretoria, 2011) and *The reception of Habakkuk 2:4 in selected literature of the Second Temple Period*, (Unpublished MTh study, University of Pretoria, 2013).

theology of the Septuagint? Cook endeavoured to formulate such “theologies” of Proverbs and Job by means of case studies. Ranging from scepticism, to a differentiation between “maximalists” and “minimalists” finally provides a safe place of orientation for each LXX researcher.

International networking with peers in this branch of LXX studies, takes shape, for example, through cooperation with the Aristotle University in Thessaloniki, Greece, during its annual International Septuagint Conference. Especially Cook and Steyn, and recently also Helen Keith-Van Wyk, interacted here on issues related to different set themes on the theology of the LXX.

Furthermore, as part of a larger research project planned by Martin Rösel and Johann Cook on the construing of a theology of the Septuagint, a symposium is currently being planned for 2018 in Stellenbosch on the theme “A Theology of the Septuagint”.

5. Narratological studies

The shift in hermeneutical studies away from diachronic approaches to synchronic approaches impacted much more drastically in South Africa than in Europe. It was especially the ground-breaking work on Greek semantics by J.P. (Jannie) Louw which influenced the generation of biblical students from the 70’s to the 90’s in this country. Deliberate efforts were made by several South African biblical scholars to steer away from historical studies and to focus “only on the text itself, not its history”. The influence of this shift with its roots in structuralism, linguistics and literature theory, inevitably led to directional changes in South African biblical scholarship. This also includes developments in LXX research and can be seen in the direction taken by Pierre Jordaán (professor for Greek at the Northwest University campus of Potchefstroom). Jordaán’s research field in LXX studies focuses mainly on the literary interpretation of the Theodotian edition. With studies in narratology,³² literature theory, linguistics, and rhetorics, Jordaán made a number of contributions particularly on the books of Judith, Susanna, and the additions to Esther,³³

³² See P.J. Jordaán and D.M. Kanonge, “Reading Narratives in the Septuagint: A Discourse on Method,” *VTS* 127 (2009), 361-381. See also idem and R.G. Branch, “The Significance of Secondary Characters in Susanna Judith and the Additions to Esther in the Septuagint,” *Acta Patristica et Byzantina* 20 (2009), 439-467.

³³ P.J. Jordaán, “Reading Judith as Therapeutic Narrative,” *VT.S* 127 (2009), 335-346; idem and R. Hobyane, “Change in Religious Ideology in the Book of Judith”. *Ekklesiastikos Pharos* 92 (2010), 334-343; idem and S.P. Nolte, “Ideology and Intertextuality: Intertextual Allusions in Judith 16”. *HTS Theological Studies* (2011) online.

but also to Daniel.³⁴ Jordaan distinguished himself, furthermore, particularly as a specialist on 2 Maccabees.³⁵

6. Reader-response studies

A similar narratological approach to that of Jordaan on LXX studies can be seen by Helen Keith-Van Wyk (senior lecturer in the School of Religion Philosophy and Classics, University of KwaZulu Natal). Being strongly influenced by the field of psycho-analysis and a reader-response approach to Biblical Studies, Keith-Van Wyk approached the LXX corpus mainly via Jungian psychological hermeneutics as well as through feminist interpretations. She wrote her doctoral thesis entitled *"The Enemy is Within: a Jungian Psychoanalytic Approach to the Book of Judith,"*³⁶ and interpreted the text as ... a dream of the unconscious psyche of the Jewish people, true in its reflection of their

P.J. Jordaan, "Reading Susanna as Therapeutic Narrative," *Journal for Semitics* 17 (2008), 114-128. See also idem and D.M. Kanonge, "On the role of Susanna in Susanna: A Greimassian Contribution". *HTS Theological Studies* (2014) online; idem and S.P. Nolte, "Susanna story of dangerous spaces", *Journal for Semitics* 19 (2010), 527-547; idem and E. Coetzer, "Performing Susanna: Speech Acts and Other Performative Elements in Susanna." *VT.S* 127 (2009), 347-360.

P.J. Jordaan, "Text, Ideology and Body in the Additions to Esther." *Ekklesiastikos Pharos* 88.1&2 (2006), 138-151; P.J. Jordaan and S.P. Nolte, "Esther's Prayer in Additions to Esther. Addition C to LXX Esther. An Embodied Cognition Approach." *Acta Patristica et Byzantina* 20 (2009), 335-352.

P.J. Jordaan, "Daniel as Weapon for Attack and Defence Through the Ages." *Ekklesiastikos Pharos* 90.19 (2008), 45-53; see also J.J. De Bruyn and P.J. Jordaan. "Constructing Realities: Bel and the Dragon- Identifying some Research Lacunae. *OTE* 27.3 (2014), 839-859.

³⁴ P.J. Jordaan, "Daniel as Weapon for Attack and Defence Through the Ages." *Ekklesiastikos Pharos* 90.19 (2008), 45-53; see also J.J. De Bruyn and P.J. Jordaan. "Constructing Realities: Bel and the Dragon- Identifying some Research Lacunae. *OTE* 27.3 (2014), 839-859.

³⁵ P.J. Jordaan, "Body, Space and Narrative in 2 Maccabees 1:10b -18." *Biblische Notizen* 168 (2016), 89-104; E. Coetser and P. Jordaan, "Investigating the communicative strategy in 2 Maccabees 3: Six scenes Which Influence the Reader's Experience Throughout the Narrative. *HTS Theological Studies* (2016) online; P.J. Jordaan, "A Narrative Therapeutic Reading of the Martyr Narratives of 2 Maccabees 6 and 7", *Yearbook of Deuterocanonical Literature* (Berlin: De Gruyter, - forthcoming); P.J. Jordaan, "The Temple in 2 Maccabees: Dynamics and Episodes," *Journal for Semitics* 24.1 (2015), 352-365. idem., "A Clash of Deities in 2 Maccabees 1:10b-17 in Terms of Body, Space and Narrative" *OTE* 26 (2013), 718-729; idem., "A Clash of Hands and Tongues – 2 Maccabees 14 and 15 in the framework of Cognitive Linguistics". *Journal of Early Christian History* 3.1 (2013), 62-72; idem. "Ritual, Rage and Revenge in 2 Maccabees 7", *HTS Theological Studies* (2011) online.

³⁶ Helen Efthimiadis-Keith, *The Enemy is within: A Jungian Psychoanalytic Approach to the Book of Judith*, Biblical Interpretation Series 67 (Boston: Brill, 2004).

collective identity at the time of the text's composition. The author merges Terrence Dawson's literary theory concerning the discernment of the effective protagonist of a narrative with Jungian's method of dream interpretation to analyze the text subjectively from the effective protagonist's point of view. The author then extrapolates the book's contents onto a hypothetical historical situation to contextualize the book within the Jewish identity, and uses her findings to conduct objective analysis.³⁷

Helen Keith-Van Wyk specialised particularly on the book of Judith,³⁸ but also contributed to studies on Tobit³⁹ and Ruth.⁴⁰

7. Conclusion

The need to interact on LXX research, engage as LXX scholars with one another, to co-operate on some common projects, as well as to co-ordinate LXX research on a national level started to emerge in 1989 when Steyn suggested the establishment of an LXX association. This suggestion became a reality in 2007 after Jordaan took the lead to organise its first meeting in Potchefstroom where the South African Septuagint Society was then formally established as the "Association for the Study of the Septuagint in South Africa" (LXXSA).

³⁷ Quoted from the cover of the author's book.

³⁸ Helen Efthimiadis-Keith, "Genealogy, Retribution and Identity: Re-Interpreting the Cause of Suffering in the Book of Judith," *Old Testament Essays* 27 (2014), 860-878; *idem.*, "What makes Men and Women Identify with Judith? A Jungian Mythological Perspective on the Feminist Value of Judith Today," *HTS Theological Studies* 68.1 (2012), online: Art. #1267; *idem.*, "On the Egyptian Origin of Judith, or Judith as Anat-Yahu" *Journal for Semitics* 20 (2011), 300-322; *idem.*, "Judith, Feminist Ethics and Feminist Biblical/Old Testament Interpretatio,," *Journal of Theology for Southern Africa* 138 (2010), 91-111; *idem.*, "Text and Interpretation: Gender and Violence in the Book of Judith, Scholarly Commentary and the Visual Arts from the Renaissance onward," *Old Testament Essays* 15 (2002), 64-84; *idem.*, "Judith: Lorena Bobbit of Yesteryear. A Psychoanalytic Perspective on the Book of Judith according to the Castration Complex," *Scriptura* 70 (1999), 211-228; *idem.*, "The Dream of Judith: a Jungian Psychoanalytic Approach," *Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages* 25 (1999), 151-169.

³⁹ Cf. Helen Efthimiadis-Keith, "Food and Death: An Autobiographic Perspective on Tobit according to One Woman's Binge-Eating Disorder," in Athalya Brenner-Idan and Helen Efthimiadis-Keith (eds.), *A Feminist Companion to Tobit and Judith* (London: Bloomsbury, 2015); *idem.*, "The Significance of Food, Eating, Death and Burial in the Book of Tobit," *Journal for Semitics*, 22 (2013), 553-578.

⁴⁰ Helen Efthimiadis-Keith, "Women, Jung and the Hebrew Bible: An evaluation of Jungian interpretations of Hebrew Bible texts by way of the Book of Ruth," *Biblical Interpretation* 23 (2015), 78-100; *idem.*, "Woman to Womyn: Countering Patriarchal Stereotypes in the Book of Ruth," *Journal for Semitics* 7 (1995), 57-78.

Its establishment greatly assisted in co-ordinating and structuring the different LXX projects on a national level. It not only provides a forum where research outcomes are shared and tested, but also an opportunity for interaction, planning and a showcase that draws attention and interest from local and international colleagues, as well as from the next generation of students. Some of the major outcomes of the LXXSA resulted in significant publications of conference papers with Brill on “Septuagint and Reception” (2009),⁴¹ and on “Text-critical and Hermeneutical Studies in the Septuagint” (2012), edited by Johann Cook and Herman-Josef Stipp.⁴²

Aside from the formalised structure of the LXXSA and its corporate contribution to LXX scholarship, the first generation of researchers positioned themselves well in LXX studies and impacted notably on different areas in this terrain.

Alongside this first generation of South African LXX scholars, a second concentric circle has formed, which can be seen in the contributions of a second generation of LXX scholars. Their role and contribution is well on its way to propel LXX research far into the future.

These research fields stand as token of diversified research and a broad spectrum of contributions from several institutions and individuals on the opposite side of the African continent where the origins of the LXX can be found.

GERT J. STEYN

University of Pretoria

Pretoria, South Africa

Gert.Steyn@THE.FeG.de

⁴¹ J. Cook, J (ed), *Septuagint and Reception. Essays prepared for the Association for the Study of the Septuagint in South Africa*, VTS 127 (Leiden: Brill, 2009).

⁴² J. Cook and H.-J. Stipp (eds.), *Textcritical and Hermeneutical Studies in the Septuagint*, VTS 157 (Leiden: Brill, 2012).

Septuagint Studies in South America: Charting a Non-Existent Territory

RODRIGO FRANKLIN DE SOUSA

The study of the LXX is an academic field whose landscape is one of the easiest to delineate geographically. Though a rather specialized area, there are clearly distinguishable methods and approaches, and it is possible to connect this diversity with specific traditions of scholarship in places like Germany, France, the United Kingdom, Finland, and North America. Sometimes the peculiarity of each region is linked with the existence of a translation project in a specific modern language (one thinks of initiatives like the *Septuaginta Deutsch*, *La Bible d'Alexandrie*, and N.E.T.S.).

Cataloguing LXX studies by geographical region is an interesting exercise also because it reveals in which parts of the world the territory still consists mostly in virgin land. LXX research in South America certainly falls into that category. In fact, a better metaphor is to see South American LXX scholarship not as an uncharted zone of a planet, but as the void existing beyond the cataracts at the edge of a world drawn by an ancient cartographer. This is because there are virtually no LXX studies in that part of the world. Yet, I propose that by charting this nonexistent territory, the relief of the global map can appear in sharper detail.

In South America, the LXX has not drawn attention in any of the academic areas that circumscribe its research. Classical studies focus primarily on different aspects of the philology, history, philosophy and literature of Classical Antiquity. In the context of Biblical studies, scholars normally operate in the more basic areas of either Hebrew Bible or New Testament. In recent years, there have been developments in the study of the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, but this is also unlikely to draw scholars to the LXX.¹ Interest in the LXX is often ciliary, and the version is normally mentioned in relation to broader considerations in the fields of literature, language, biblical studies or

¹ See, for instance, the collected articles in P. A. de S. Nogueira (ed.), *Apocriçidade: o cristianismo primitivo para além do cânon* (São Paulo: Fonte Editorial, 2015).

history of religions.² Specific research on the Septuagint in its own right shows very few signs of life.

Spanish speaking South American countries may benefit from relevant academic material from Spain, but this has apparently had the negative effect of discouraging even further local production. In the case of Brazil, which represents about half of the South American population and a significant percentage of the region's academic output, the picture is also affected by the use of Portuguese.³ A closer look at the Brazilian context offers a good perspective on the state of research in the continent as a whole.

The first book on the LXX produced in Brazil was published in 2009, but rather than a proper academic introduction written by a specialist, it is a religiously oriented book written primarily with apologetic purposes.⁴ The few available academic books on the LXX are translations. To this date, students with an interest in the subject can consult Portuguese versions of *La Bible Grecque des Septante* by Marguerite Harl, Giles Dorival, and Olivier Munnich, and *Einführung in die Septuaginta*, by Michael Tilly.⁵ Another – somewhat surprising – publication is Conybeare and Stock's *Grammar of the Septuagint Greek*, which remains the sole linguistic tool for the study of LXX published in Brazilian Portuguese.⁶ The most recent addition is Emanuel Tov's *The Greek and Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint*.⁷

To my knowledge, the first academic article on the LXX ever written originally in Portuguese for a Brazilian specialized periodical, appeared in 2008, offering a general introduction to the subject.⁸ A second article appeared in 2010, and consisted in a study of the translation of cultic and legal vocabulary

² A representative example of this approach is the article by J. P. Martín, "De la Septuaginta a Bizancio: transiciones en la historia de una lengua," *Circe* 8 (2003), 189-202, from Argentina.

³ The other national languages of South America (English and French in the respective Guianas, and Dutch in Surinam) are not part of our description, as there is no academic production in these contexts that is relevant to our study.

⁴ E. Soares, *Septuaginta: guia histórico e literário* (São Paulo: Hagnos, 2009).

⁵ M. Harl, et al., *A Bíblia Grega dos Setenta: do judaísmo helenístico ao cristianismo antigo* (São Paulo: Loyola, 2007); M. Tilly, *Introdução à Septuaginta* (São Paulo: Loyola, 2009).

⁶ F. C. Conybeare and S. G. W. J. Stock, *Gramática do grego da Septuaginta* (São Paulo: Loyola, 2011).

⁷ E. Tov, *A Bíblia Grega e Hebraica: ensaios reunidos sobre a Septuaginta* (São Paulo: BV Books, 2017).

⁸ P. P. A. dos Santos, "A Septuaginta (LXX): a Torá na diáspora judaico-helenista," *Arquivo Maaravi: Revista de Estudos Judaicos da Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais* 2, no. 2 (2008), 1-14.

in the Greek Pentateuch.⁹ After these two publications, articles about the LXX have conspicuously disappeared in Brazil.

The prospects for the growth of LXX studies in South America are, therefore, bleak. The lack of interest in the field in this part of the world has many causes, which include little information on the possibilities of research, and the need for a specialized set of skills, requiring command at least of Hebrew and Greek, as well as of modern languages such as English, French, or German.

Another significant element that discourages scholarship in the area is the high cost of research material. Primary and secondary sources in LXX and cognate studies can be prohibitively expensive, and in a context where libraries are considered privileged if they have access to databases such as ATLA or JSTOR, it is unlikely that you will find helpful resources like, for instance, the full corpus of the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*. It is considerably difficult to justify the costs involved in establishing a library with good LXX resources before governmental agencies and other funding bodies, given the prospective outcomes of research projects on the LXX. Therefore, researchers will most likely gravitate to other fields where funding is more easily available.

Scholarship in various fields of religious and literary studies is progressing in exciting new directions in South America. Yet, all evidence suggests that in the case of LXX research, at least in the current shape that the field assumed in the West, this region is likely to remain a blank spot in the global map.

RODRIGO FRANKLIN DE SOUSA

Faculté Jean Calvin

Aix en Provence, France

rodrigoeana@hotmail.com

⁹ R. F. de Sousa, "Considerações acerca do vocabulário cúltico e legal na versão grega da Torá: tradução na fronteira entre judaísmo e helenismo," *Cadernos de Língua e Literatura Hebraica* - Universidade de São Paulo 08 (2010), 149-160.

The LXX of the Law of Deposit in Exodus 22:6-14

JELLE VERBURG

⁶ If someone gives to his neighbour money or vessels to guard, and it is stolen from the house of the man, if the thief is found, he will repay double. ⁷ But if the thief is not found, the owner of the house will be brought before God and swear that he himself did not deal maliciously towards the entire deposit of his neighbour. ⁸ Concerning every unjust word about an ox, a mule, a sheep, a mantle, and every lost object of the accused, whatever it may be, the decision of both will be brought before God, and the one convicted by God will repay double to his neighbour. ⁹ If someone gives to his neighbour a mule, a sheep, an ox, or any animal to guard, and it is hurt, dies, or is taken captive, and no one knows, ¹⁰ there will be an oath of God between both that he did not deal maliciously with the entire deposit of his neighbour, and thus its owner will accept it, and he will not repay. ¹¹ But if it is stolen from him, he will repay the owner. ¹² If it is caught by a wild beast, he will lead him to the animal of prey and not repay. ¹³ If someone asks something from his neighbour, and it is wounded or it dies, its owner is not with him, he will repay. ¹⁴ But if the owner is with him, he will not repay. If he is hired, it will be instead of his hire.

(LXX Exodus 22:6-14)¹

Introduction

Exodus 22:6-14 contains a detailed law of deposit, a handover of goods without transfer of ownership. The law of deposit in the Covenant Code is a rare testimony to the early development of conceptions of ownership, a notoriously complex legal topic, in Ancient Israel and the Ancient Near East.² This passage, together with Leviticus 5:20-26, was the point of departure for all later

¹ Translation based on the Göttingen edition of the LXX, see John William Wevers, *Exodus* (Septuaginta II,1; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991), 259-61. All translations of primary sources are my own, unless otherwise indicated. Throughout this essay I have adopted the verse numbering of the Hebrew, 22:6-14, rather than that of the LXX, 22:7-15.

² See for example Eckhart Otto, "Die rechtshistorische Entwicklung des Depositarechts in altorientalischen und altisraelitischen Rechtskorpora," *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für*

Jewish discussions on the subject of ownership, as found in the compilations of rabbinic halakha. Interestingly, the LXX differs from the extant Hebrew versions at crucial points, which begs the question what might have inspired such diversions. That is why, in this essay, I will probe the question: How does the LXX translation relate to the rabbinic interpretations of the law of deposit, and why?

Frankel, Geiger, Prijs, and Schaper have pointed out the similarities between the LXX translation and the rabbinic interpretation of the law of deposit.³ The examples they cited, however, were limited to individual words and short phrases. In the first part of this essay, I will discuss four of the examples they cited in support of their hypothesis, all from the law of deposit in Exodus 22. In the second part, I will argue that when the LXX of the law of deposit is read as whole, it turns out that the LXX translation differs markedly from the rabbinic interpretation, even if some details of the LXX can indeed be taken to prove the antiquity of some legal traditions. The LXX presents a unified law of deposit that applies to all cases regardless of the type of the deposit—which is the criterion of distinction in the Hebrew versions—and regardless of the obligations of the deposittee to the depositor—which is the criterion of distinction in the rabbinic interpretations. In the third part, I will compare the vocabulary of LXX Exodus 22:6-14 to that of some legal papyri from Hellenistic Egypt, arguing that the translators' understanding of the biblical law of deposit makes good sense in the light of contemporary practice of law.

Rechtsgeschichte, Romanistische Abteilung 105 (1988): 1-31; reprint in *Kontinuum und Proprium: Studien zur Sozial- und Rechtsgeschichte des Alten Orients und des Alten Testaments* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1996), 139-63; Ludger Schwienhorst-Schönberger, *Das Bundesbuch (Ex 20,22-23,33): Studien zu seiner Entstehung und Theologie* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 188; Berlin: De Gruyter, 1990), 196-231; Horst Seebass, "Noch einmal zum Depositenrecht Ex 22,6-14," in *Gottes Recht als Lebensraum: Festschrift für Hans Jochen Boecker* (ed. P. Mommer, W.H. Schmidt, and H. Strauss; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1993), 21-31; Raymond Westbrook, "The Deposit Law of Exodus 22,6-12," *Zeitschrift für alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 106 (1994): 390-403; Bernard Jackson, *Wisdom-Laws: A Study of the Mishpatim of Exodus 12:1-22:16* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 331-66; Yael Landman, "The Biblical Law of Bailment in Its Ancient Near Eastern Contexts" (Ph.D. Diss., Yeshiva University, 2017).

³ See Zacharias Frankel, *Vorstudien zu der Septuaginta* (Leipzig: Vogel, 1841); idem, *Ueber den Einfluss der palästinischen Exegese auf die alexandrinische Hermeneutik* (Leipzig: Vogel, 1851); Abraham Geiger, *Urschrift und Uebersetzungen der Bibel in ihrer Abhängigkeit von der innern Entwicklung des Judenthums* (Breslau, 1857); Leo Prijs, *Jüdische Tradition in der Septuaginta* (Leiden: Brill, 1948); Joachim Schaper, "Exodos," in *Septuaginta Deutsch: Erläuterungen und Kommentare zum griechischen Alten Testament* (ed. M. Karree and W. Kraus; 2 vols.; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2011), 1:258-324.

The LXX and Rabbinic Halakha

No fewer than four scholars—Frankel, Geiger, Prijs, and Schaper—have argued that the details of the Greek translation of the law of deposit are similar to rabbinic halakha. Each of them conceived differently of the precise relation between the LXX and rabbinic halakha, although all four emphasised the similarities rather than the differences between the Greek translation and the various rabbinic interpretations of the law of deposit. In order to do justice to their arguments, I have quoted each of them directly before assessing the validity of each argument.

1. καὶ ὁμείται (v. 7): Frankel, *Ueber den Einfluss*, 94: “Der Zusatz ‘καὶ ὁμείται’ ist im Sinne der Halacha, welche erklärt: קריבה זו אינה אלא לשבועה (*Baba Kama* 63 und sonst häufig).” Prijs, *Jüdische Tradition*, 2: “Dieser LXX-Zusatz entspricht Baba q. 63b”. Schaper, “Exodos,” 304: “Wir haben hier tatsächlich, wie auch an anderen Orten des LXX-Pentateuchs und anderer Bestandteile der griech. Bible, ein Beispiel für die Benutzung jüd. exegetischer Techniken in der Frühzeit ihrer Anwendung auf biblische Texte. Auch hier zeigt sich, das die LXX durch und durch zum “Traditionsstrom” ... des hell. geprägten Frühjudentums gehört. In künstlicher Isolation von diesem betrachtet, bleibt sie letztlich unverstündlich.”

In v. 7, the LXX translators rendered the enigmatic phrase “and the owner of the house will be brought to God” (ונקרב בעל הבית אל האלהים) as “the owner of the house will be brought before God *and he will swear*” (προσελεύσεται ὁ κύριος τῆς οἰκίας ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ὁμείται). Frankel, Prijs, and Schaper referred to the Babylonian Talmud and the Mekhilta deRabbi Ishmael to explain the insertion of “and he will swear”. The Talmud does indeed cite Exodus 22:7 as if referring to an oath, so for example: “From where do we learn that it is about an oath? ‘The owner of the house shall be brought to God’ *for an oath*” (ומנלן דבשבועה דתניא ונקרב בעל הבית אל האלהים לשבועה) b. Baba Qamma 63b). The Mekhilta gives the exact same interpretation: “The owner of the house shall be brought to God *for an oath*” (ונקרב בעל הבית אל האלהים לשבועה) Mekhilta Neziqin 15). However, both compilations of rabbinic halakha contain more than just one interpretation of this verse. The Gemara of the Babylonian Talmud offers an alternative interpretation immediately following the interpretation quoted above: “You say ‘for an oath’ but why not ‘to the court’?” (אתה אומר לשבועה או אינו אלא לדין b. Baba Qamma 63b). The Mekhilta offers a variety of possible interpretations, and that of the oath does not seem to have been the preferred interpretation:

ונקרב בעל הבית אל האלהים שומע אני לשאול באורים ותומים ת"ל אשר ירשעון אלהים לא אמרתי אלא אלהים שהם מרשיעין. ונקרב בעל הבית אל האלהים לשבועה אתה אומר לשבועה או אינו אלא בשבועה ושלא בשבועה הרי אתה דן נאמר כאן שליחות יד שנאמר א"ד ה"א אף כאן ביו"ד ה"מ להלן ביו מה להלן שבועה אף כאן שבועה להלן שליחות יד מה באן בבית דין אף להלן בבית דין מה כאן לצרכיו אף להלן לצרכיו מה כאן על כל דבר פשע אף להלן על כל דבר פשע. (Mekhilta Neziqin 15)

I understand 'The owner of the house will be brought to God' to mean to consult the Urim and the Thummim, but I say that 'the one condemned by 'elohim' refers to nothing but the judges who condemn. You say that 'The owner of the house will be brought to God' for an oath, but perhaps this is not so. Perhaps it refers to an oath, perhaps it does not refer to an oath. Look, you have to assume that the stretching of the hand there (in v. 10) is the same as the stretching of the hand here (in v. 7), that the oath there is the same as the oath here, that the oath by the divine name there is the same as the oath by the divine name here, that the case is decided in a court of law there just as the case is decided in a court of law here, that the embezzlement of property for his own need there is the same as the embezzlement of property for his own need here, and that 'every matter of trespass' there is the same as 'every matter of trespass' here.⁴

Without plunging into the detailed discussion that ensues in the tractate, it should be clear that explaining the LXX in light of the rabbinic halakha is not as straightforward as one might think. To argue that the addition of καὶ ὀμειῖται in the LXX is in the sense of rabbinic halakha or to argue that the addition is incomprehensible without reference to rabbinic halakha, needs further qualification. It is by no means necessary to suppose that the LXX translators were familiar either with the methods of rabbinic halakha or with the conclusions drawn from those methods to explain the insertion of καὶ ὀμειῖται "and he will swear" in v. 7. Quite possibly, the translators noticed the verbal similarity between vv. 7 and 10 and concluded that the words "if he did not stretch out his hand to the property of his neighbour" (אם לא שלח ידו במלאכת רעהו) must have referred to an exculpatory oath in both cases. That is in fact the road that many modern translators and commentators have chosen, not only because of the

⁴ Translation based on the edition of Jacob Z. Lauterbach, *Mekhilta de-Rabbi Ishmael: A Critical Edition, Based on the Manuscripts and Early Editions, with an English Translation, Introduction, and Notes* (2 vols.; Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 2004), 436, 438.

analogy with v. 10 but also because of the frequency of exculpatory oaths for lost property in other laws from the Ancient Near East.⁵ Whether this conclusion is right or wrong is a different question altogether,⁶ the point is that modern and ancient translators alike have arrived at the same conclusion without necessarily being familiar with rabbinic halakha.

2. πεπονηρεῦσθαι (v. 7): Frankel, *Ueber den Einfluss*, 94: “Auch das πεπονηρεῦσθαι ... scheint eine der Halacha nähernde Bedeutung zu haben. Nach der Halacha nämlich wird ihm der Eid auferlegt, dass er nicht nur den Gegenstand nicht veruntreuet, sondern auch in dessen Aufbewahrung nicht nachlässig war (שלא פשע בה) vergl. *Baba Kama* 107. *Baba Mezia* 6. *Maimonides Schaala* c. 6. §. 1).” Prijs, *Jüdische Tradition*, 2: “Hier verallgemeinert es das ‘Handausstrecken’: der שומר muss schwören, das er überhaupt nichts Unrechtes beging. So auch Baba q. vom שומר הנם”. Schaper, “Exodos,” 304: “Auf den ersten Blick liegt kaum ein Unterschied zum MT vor, doch verallgemeinert die LXX dessen Aussage und ist damit wiederum der Vorreiter einer halachischen Entwicklung, die sich dann voll im rabb. Judentum findet”.

The translators’ choice of words in this verse is surprising to say the least. It is hard to see, however, how the rabbinic passages dealing with פשע “transgression” can explain the translation of “to stretch out a hand” (שלה יד) into “to act wickedly” (πονηρεύομαι), for nowhere in the LXX corpus is the root פשע translated into either “act wickedly” (πονηρεύομαι) or “bad” (πονηρός). It seems more plausible that the inclusion of פשע in the rabbinic discussion on the law of deposit in b. Baba Qamma 107a and Baba Mezia 6a did not derive from “stretch out one’s hand” (שלה יד) in v. 7, but from “every matter of transgression” (כל דבר פשע) in v. 8. It is quite possible that the translators recognised that the Hebrew idiom “to stretch out a hand” (שלה יד) has a wide semantic range, including “to touch”, “to reach”, “to grasp”, and “to kill”.⁷ Here are two

⁵ Exculpatory oaths in cases of property delicts can be found in the Code of Hammurabi and the Laws of Eshnunna, see Oswald Loretz, “Ex. 21,6; 22,8 und angebliche Nuzi-Parallelen,” *Biblica* 41 (1960): 167-75.

⁶ In other contexts, the phrase קרב אל (ה)אלהים means to approach God in order to sacrifice (Leviticus 21:17; Ecclesiastes 4:17), in order to serve in the tabernacle (Numbers 16:9), in order to introduce complicated cases of law (Deuteronomy 1:17), in order to ask for an oracle (1 Samuel 14:36). See also Zephaniah 3:2, where the meaning of אל אליה לא קרבה “to her God she did not approach” is unclear.

⁷ Paul Humbert, “Entendre la main” (Note de lexicographie hébraïque), *VT* 12 (1962), 388: ‘Il appert donc que l’expression *šālah yād* désigne un geste banal et rapide (cp. le choix du verbe *šālah!*) de la main, soit au sens purement naturel et physique pour saisir un objet,

examples where the LXX translators interpreted יד שלח in a graver sense than merely “stretch one’s hand”, the first of which—from the theophany in Exodus 24—shows an effort to avoid anthropomorphism:

וְאֵל אֲצִילֵי בְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל לֹא שָׁלַח יָדוֹ (Exod 24:11a)

To the nobles of the sons of Israel he did not stretch out his hand

καὶ τῶν ἐπιλέκτων τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ οὐ διεφώνησεν οὐδὲ εἶς·

Of the chosen ones of Israel not even one disappeared.

וַיִּבְקֶשׁוּ לְשַׁלַּח יָד בַּמֶּלֶךְ אֲחַשְׁוֶרֶשׁ (Esth 2:21b)

They sought to stretch out a hand to the king Ahasuerus.

καὶ ἐζήτουν ἀποκτεῖναι Ἀρταξέρξη τὸν βασιλέα.

They sought to kill Artaxerxes the king.

One of the reasons why the translators settled for “to act wickedly” in particular to describe the offence against a deposit in Exodus 22:7, can perhaps be found in the papyri from Egypt (see below).

3. ἀπωλείας τῆς ἐγκαλουμένης (v. 8): Frankel, *Ueber den Einfluss*, 95: “In Alexandrien mochte ebenfalls dieser Gebrauch, aber in veränderter Weise, herrschend gewesen sein: wer einen Gegenstand verloren hatte, liess ihn ausrufen, dass man ihn einliefere”.

Frankel suggested that the Septuagint of Exodus 22:8 reflects the Alexandrian custom of going about the city to “call out” for lost objects. Since there is no evidence at all for such a custom ever being put into practice, Frankel’s suggestion is rather speculative. Furthermore, Frankel implies that ἐγκαλέω is synonymous with “ausrufen” or “to call out”, which it is not. The verb ἐγκαλέω does not mean “ausrufen” or “to call out”, for which ἐκκαλέω would have been a more suitable alternative, but rather “to call in”, because it is a compound of “in” (ἐν) and “to call” (καλέω). In legal contexts, and in the legal papyri from Egypt too, ἐγκαλέω is often used with the more specific meaning of “to accuse”.⁸

soit avec une connotation morale pour une entreprise ou une main-mise, de nature surtout hostile, mais, très exceptionnellement, pacifique.’ Ibidem, 391: ‘*šālah yād*, un geste banal et avant tout humain, un geste préhensif, de prise de possession, d’entreprise, ou d’attentat.’

⁸ Friedrich Preisigke, *Wörterbuch der griechischen Papyrusurkunden mit Einschluß der griechischen Inschriften, Aufschriften, Ostraka, Mumienbilder usw. aus Ägypten*, Vol. 1 (ed. E. Riesling; Berlin: Selbstverlag der Erben, 1925), 411-12: “Schuldforderung geltend machen, Vorwürfe erheben, sich beschweren, jemanden bei der Behörde anzeigen, gerichtliche Klage erheben, Belege insgesamt.”

4. ὅ τι οὖν ἂν ᾖ (v. 8): Prijs, *Jüdische Tradition*, 4: “Auch B. q. 54 b wird festgestellt, dass שור etc. nur als typische Beispiele aufgezählt sind: דבר הכתוב בהווה *der Schriftvers spricht von dem, was gewöhnlich vorkommt* (wörtlich *vom Seienden*).”

Biblical laws often just mention cases involving one animal, typically a sheep, a donkey, or an ox. In Exodus 21:33-34, for instance, it is said that “if a man opens a cistern and if a man digs out a cistern and does not cover it and an ox or a donkey falls in it, the owner of the cistern should repay its owner, and the dead (animal) shall be his.” Mentioning just one or two animals is completely normal in the genre of casuistic laws from the Ancient Near East. However, later readers—including the rabbis—raised the question to what extent the laws could be extended. In such cases, the scribes of the Samaritan Pentateuch often added “any animal” (כל בהמה).⁹ The Babylonian Talmud also includes a wide-ranging discussion on this topic in b. Baba Qamma 54b, where it is suggested that the ox of Exodus 22:8 includes all species of cattle. The principle quoted by Prijs, “scripture speaks of the usual” (דבר הכתוב בהווה), is taken from the Mishnah:

אחד שור ואחד כל בהמה לנפילת הבור ולהפרשת הר סיני ולתשלומי כפל ולהשבת אבידה
כ למה נאמר שור או חמור “לפריקה לחסימה לכלאים ולשבת וכן חיה ועוף כיוצא בהן א
אלא שדבר הכתוב בהווה (m. Baba Qamma 5.7/8)

An ox and any animal are alike to the law of falling in the pit, separating from mount Sinai, repaying double, returning something lost, unloading, muzzling, *kilayim*, and the sabbath. And thus it applies to animal and bird. If so, why is it said ‘an ox’ or ‘a donkey’? Scripture speaks of the usual.¹⁰

However, none of the rabbis, when discussing this passage, imply that Exodus 22:8—or any other law mentioning a sheep, a donkey, or an ox for that matter—is valid beyond animals. And that is exactly what the LXX implicitly does with the words “whatever it may be” (ὅ τι οὖν ἂν ᾖ).

⁹ Michael A. Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1985), 170.

¹⁰ The translation of הווה into ‘usual’—for which, see Marcus Jastrow, *A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature* (New York: Chabad, 1926), 338—is not uncontested. See Herbert Danby, *The Mishnah Translated from the Hebrew with Brief Explanatory Notes* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1933), 339: ‘Scripture speaks only of *what happens in fact*.’

Typologies of Deposit

Although the four scholars picked up on different details and often reached different conclusions, they shared a focus on the details of the law of deposit, often singling out a single word or a small phrase for discussion. Here, I would like to pay some attention to the overarching structure of the law by asking the question: How do the versions of the law distinguish between different degrees of liability, and why? The Hebrew law distinguishes between deposits of “silver or vessels” (כסף או כלים) in vv. 6-7 and deposits of animals in vv. 9-14. The law deals differently with theft of property than theft of animals: if property is stolen from the guardian’s home he doesn’t have to repay the owner, for if the thief is found, the thief is held liable for double restitution (ישראל שנים v. 6), and if he isn’t found, the guardian can exculpate himself by means of a declaration—if that is what it is—before God (v. 7). However, if an animal is stolen, it doesn’t matter whether the thief is found or not, the guardian is held liable for restitution regardless: “and if it is stolen from him, he should repay its owner” (וּאִם גָּנַב יִגְנַב מֵעַמּוֹ יִשְׁלַם לִבְעָלָיו v. 11).

Clearly, then, the biblical law distinguished between various types of deposits. But on what grounds? Scholars have argued that the plain meaning of the text distinguished between deposits on the grounds of the nature of the deposit. Childs argued that “the differentiation is simply on the grounds of the object deposited”,¹¹ and Jackson ascertained that “the only apparent difference between the two cases is that the first deals with the deposit of moveable property (“silver or vessels”), while the latter deals with the deposit of animals.”¹² Using the jargon of modern jurisprudence, we could say that the biblical law of deposit imposed different sanctions on the thief of silver or vessels—“inanimate property”—than on the thief of oxen, mules, and sheep—“animate property”.

In the Talmud, we find quite a different typology of deposit, which is based on the financial relationship between the depositor and the deposittee. This meant, in short, that the degree of liability corresponded to the degree of financial benefit. In other words, if a guardian agreed to take care of someone’s cow without receiving any remuneration, the owner retained responsibility for anything that might happen to his cow. If, on the other hand, someone borrowed a sheep—to profit from its milk and its wool—without paying any rent to the owner of the sheep, the borrower retained responsibility and should pay the owner if the

¹¹ Brevard S. Childs, *Exodus: A Commentary* (London: SCM, 1974), 475. Westbrook, “Exodus 22,6-12,” 402-3: “Ex 22,6-12 contains two laws on deposit, the first concerning property consigned to a person’s house and the second livestock entrusted to a herdsman.”

¹² Jackson, *Wisdom-Laws*, 335.

sheep was wounded, went missing, or was found dead. In other cases, both the owner and the guardian shared responsibility for the exchanged property. The rabbis first introduced a distinction between four classes of guardians, formulated most clearly in a short passage that occurs twice in the Mishnah:

ארבעה שומרים הן שומר חנם והשואל נושא שכר והשוכר שומר חנם נשבע על הכל והשואל משלם את הכל ונושא שכר והשוכר נשבעים על השבורה ועל השבויה ועל המתה ומשלמין את האבידה ואת הגניבה (m. Baba Metzi'a 7.8; m. Shevu'ot 8.1)

There are four guardians: an unpaid guardian, the borrower, a receiver of hire, and the hirer. The unpaid guardian may take an oath in every case, the borrower should make restitution in every case, the receiver of hire and the hirer may take an oath if the animal is injured, captured, or killed, but they must make restitution if the animal is lost or stolen.

The rabbis developed this fourfold distinction in interaction with the biblical text. They understood Exodus 22:6-8 to refer to the unpaid guardian, vv. 9-12 to the paid guardian, vv. 13-14 to the borrower, and v. 14b to the hirer. Later on, the rabbis reduced the four types of bailment to three: “If this is so, four? There are three” (באי הכי ארבעה שלשה נינהו) (Baba Metzi'a 93a).¹³ Since both the receiver of hire (נושא שכר) and the hirer (שוכר) were liable for fraud and negligence but not for accident, there was no legal difference between the responsibilities of either. There are, however, some differences between biblical and rabbinic law. Most notably, the text of the Torah does not mention any payment whatsoever until v. 14b. Additionally, the category of the hirer (שוכר)—that is, a guardian who pays money to the owner to rent his property—is a rabbinic invention that has no counterpart in biblical law.

How did the LXX distinguish between different types of deposit, and why? This question is difficult to answer, and for good reasons. It seems that the translation has blurred the distinction between animate and inanimate property. In Exodus 22:8, “that this is it” (כי הוא זה) is translated into into “whatever it may be” (ὅ τι οὖν ἂν ᾖ), presupposing that any object could be claimed as lost property:

κατὰ πᾶν ῥητὸν ἀδίκημα περί τε μόσχου καὶ ὑπόζυγιου καὶ προβάτου καὶ ἱματίου καὶ πάσης ἀπωλείας τῆς ἐγκαλουμένης, ὅ τι οὖν ἂν ᾖ, ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ ἐλεύσεται ἡ κρίσις ἀμφοτέρων, καὶ ὁ ἄλως διὰ τοῦ θεοῦ ἀποτείσει

¹³ On the historical development of this law, see Shmuel Safrai, “Oral Torah,” in *The Literature of the Sages* (ed. S. Safrai et al.; Compendia rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum 2.3; Assen: Van Gorcum, 1987), 83.

διπλοῦν τῷ πλησίον. (Exodus 22:8)

Concerning every unjust word about an ox, a mule, a sheep, a mantle, and every lost object of the accused, whatever it may be, the decision of both will be brought before God, and the one convicted by God will repay double to his neighbour.

Furthermore, the insertion of the phrase “and he will swear” in v. 7, whether justified or not (see above), has the effect of obscuring the distinction between the methods of exculpation for the embezzlement of animate and inanimate property. In the Hebrew original there is a difference, however subtle, between the declaration of v. 7 and the oath of v. 10 that is lost in translation:

καὶ ὁμειται ἡ μὴν μὴ αὐτὸς πεπονηρεῦσθαι ἐφ’ ὅλης τῆς παρακαταθήκης τοῦ πλησίον. ... ὅρκος ἔσται τοῦ θεοῦ ἀνὰ μέσον ἀμφοτέρων ἡ μὴν μὴ αὐτὸν πεπονηρεῦσθαι καθ’ ὅλης τῆς παρακαταθήκης τοῦ πλησίον
(Exodus 22:7, 10)

and he will swear that he himself did not deal maliciously with the entire deposit of his neighbour. ... there will be oath of God between both that he did not deal maliciously with the entire deposit of his neighbour.

Although the Hebrew of vv. 7 and 10 looked very similar, with the words “if he did not stretch out his hand to his neighbour’s property” (אם לא שלח ידו) featuring in both verses, the legal contexts in which those words occur is different: the first is a declaration in the case of theft of inanimate property, the second is an oath in the case of injury, loss, or death of animate property. In the LXX, the verbal similarity has become a legal similarity, with the same method of exculpation now governing both the theft of animate and inanimate property. The combined effect of the insertion of an oath for theft of inanimate property in v. 7 and the inclusion of “whatever it may be” in v. 8 is the presentation of a more unified law of deposit. This is in striking contrast to the efforts of the rabbinic interpretation of the law, which was aimed at a more precise distinction between the types of deposit.

Philo of Alexandria continued along the same interpretative road as the LXX, which was the starting point of his interpretation, and further unified the biblical law of deposit. In his work *On the Special Laws*, he presented a philosophical interpretation of the laws of the Torah. Philo does away with the distinction between animate and inanimate property altogether:

ἐὰν οὖν <ἐν> παρακαταθήκη θρέμματα τελευτήσῃ, μεταπεμψάσθω τὸν

ἐπιτρέψαντα ὁ λαβὼν καὶ ἐπιδεικνύτω, φαύλης ὑπονοίας ῥυόμενος ἑαυτόν· εἰ δὲ ἔκδημος ὢν τυγχάνοι, καλεῖν μὲν ἑτέρους οὐχ ἄρμόττον, οὕς λαμβάνειν ἐσπούδασεν ἴσως ὁ πιστεύσας, ὁμνῦναι δ' ἀναγκαῖον ἐπανήκοντι περὶ τοῦ μὴ ἐπισκιάζειν ἐψευσμένῳ θανάτῳ νοσοφισμὸν ἄδικον. (Philo, *Spec.* 4.36)

So if any animal left in trust dies the person who has accepted the trust must send for the consigner and show him the dead body, thus shielding himself against any suspicion of dishonesty. If the consigner is absent from home, it would not be right for the caretaker to summon other people from whom the depositor may have wished to keep the matter secret, but when he has come home he must swear to him to show that he is not using a fictitious death to cloak an embezzlement.¹⁴

Here, Philo has merged the two methods of exculpation—the oath of 22:7, 10 with the evidence of 22:12—into one. Philo argued that the guardian of an animal too may exculpate himself by means of an oath—“he must swear to him etc.”—but no such provision is found in the biblical law, which requires either a witness or evidence of the torn animal to be presented to its owner. The difference between the methods of the rabbis and the methods of Philo could not be stronger, according to Jackson: “Philo’s approach is the exact opposite of the argumentative procedure adopted by the Rabbis.”¹⁵ Philo, who relied exclusively on the Greek translation of the Hebrew Bible, may have found validation of his unifying interpretation in the LXX of Exodus 22, where the distinction between animate and inanimate property is not as sharp as in biblical law.

Παρακαταθήκη “Deposit”

A detail that has been overlooked by modern scholars is the rendering of “possession” (מְלָאכָה) as “deposit” (παρακαταθήκη) in Exodus 22:7 and 10. Elsewhere, however, the translators of Exodus always settled on “deed” (ἔργον) instead. In fact, both מְלָאכָה and ἔργον cover similarly broad semantic fields. Koehler and Baumgartner define מְלָאכָה as “trade mission, business journey, business, work, handiwork, craftsmanship, objects, wares, service, service in

¹⁴ Translation by Francis H. Colson, *Philo, Volume VIII* (LCL 341; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press 1939), 28-29.

¹⁵ Jackson, *Wisdom-Laws*, 335.

the cult”, while Liddell and Scott paraphrase ἔργον as “work, deed, action, battle, contest, tillage, tilled land, land, property, wealth, possession, occupation, execution, thing, matter, point, mischief, trouble, that which is wrought or made, machine, building, result of work, profit, interest”.¹⁶ Why, then, did the translators deviate from their normal approach to כִּסְלָמ and opt for the more specific “deposit” (παρακαταθήκη) instead? To answer that question, we need to understand what a παρακαταθήκη is.

The nouns παρακαταθήκη and παραθήκη occur frequently in Greek literature, inscriptions, and papyri from the fifth century BCE onwards, but since they appear both in legal and non-legal contexts, they cannot always be defined with the desired exactitude. In Greek literature it is often impossible to distinguish between a “deposit” (παρακαταθήκη), a “loan” (δάνειον), or “use” (χρησις) in general.¹⁷ Aristotle, however, or a later student emulating his style, came close to giving an actual definition of παρακαταθήκη:

Διὰ τί παρακαταθήκην δεινότερον ἀποστερεῖν ἢ δάνειον; ἢ ὅτι αἰσχρὸν ἀδικεῖν φίλον; ὁ μὲν οὖν τὴν παρακαταθήκην ἀποστερῶν φίλον ἀδικεῖ· οὐδεὶς γὰρ παρακατατίθεται μὴ πιστεύων. οὗ δὲ τὸ χρέος, οὐ φίλος· οὐ γὰρ δανείζει, ἐὰν ᾗ φίλος, ἀλλὰ δίδωσιν. (Aristotle, *Probl.* 29.2)

Why is it more terrible to steal a deposit than a loan? Is it because it is shameful to commit an injustice against a friend? Someone who steals a deposit commits an injustice against a friend, for no one makes a deposit except with someone he trusts, but where there is debt there is no friend, for no one lends to a friend, but gives.¹⁸

The παρακαταθήκη also occurs several times in papyri from Hellenistic Egypt. In the best preserved of these papyri, a third-century letter from the Zenon archive, a certain Patumis inquires about the cows he deposited with Zenon:¹⁹

[Ζήνωνι χαίρε]ιν Πατῦμις Ἀραπάκτιος ἰσιονό[μος. ἐπίστη]ι διότι παρακαταθήκην δέδω[κα τὰς βο]ῦς τῆς Ἰσεως καὶ Ὀσίρεως. καλῶς οὖν

¹⁶ Ludwig Koehler and Walter Baumgartner, *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament* (ed. J.J. Stamm; trans. M.E.J. Richardson; 5 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 1995), 586.

¹⁷ Dieter Simon, “Quasi-ΠΑΡΑΚΑΤΑΘΗΚΗ: Zugleich ein Beitrag zur Morphologie griechisch-hellenistischer Schuldrechtstatbestände,” *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte* 82 (1965), 39-66.

¹⁸ Translation based on the edition in Robert Mayhew and David C. Mirhady, *Aristotle, Volume XVI* (LCL 317; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2011), 250-53.

¹⁹ Colin H. Roberts and Eric G. Turner, *Catalogue of the Greek and Latin Papyri in the John Rylands Library, Manchester: Documents of the Ptolemaic, Roman, and Byzantine Periods* (no. 552-717) (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1952), 16.

[ποιήσει]ς, εἰ καὶ σοὶ δοκεῖ, ἦν ἂν σοὶ δοκῇ βους [ἐκ τούτ]ων λαβεῖν, τὰς δὲ λοιπὰς ἀποδοῦναι [ὅπως ἄ]ν ἔχω τὸμ βίον ἐξ αὐτῶν. ἐσκέπασες [ἡμᾶς κ]αὶ ἀρχῆς, ἔτι δὲ καὶ νῦν οὐδεὶς ἡμᾶς [μὴ σκε]πάσῃ ἀλλ' ἢ σὺ οὐνεκεν τῆς Ἰσεως. [οὐδενὶ γ]ὰρ ἂν ἐπίστευσα ἀλλ' ἢ σοὶ ἵνα σκεπά [σῃς ἡμᾶς]. εὐτύχει. (P.Ryl. 569)

To Zenon: greeting from Patumis, son of Harapaktis, steward of Isis. You know that I have given to you as a deposit the cows of Isis and Osiris. Be good enough, therefore, if you too agree, to take whichever one of them you please and give me back the rest, in order that I may gain my living from them. You protected us in the beginning, and now again no one but you will protect us, for the sake of Isis. For I would not trust anyone but you to protect us. May you prosper.

The editors of this papyrus, Roberts and Turner, questioned whether the παρακαταθήκη in this case was a “legal deposit” or an “informal trust”, because the petitioner “seems to request the return of the cattle as a favour rather than a right.”²⁰ However, it is equally plausible that the παρακαταθήκη mentioned in P.Ryl. 569 is perfectly legitimate, and Patumis, or the scribe he employed, is merely expressing himself in the courteous aphorisms that make the letter appear to us more polite than strictly necessary.

P.Ryl. 569 mentions the deposit of “cows” (βοῦς), but deposits were not restricted to cattle alone, for other papyri from the Hellenistic period refer to deposits of moveable goods. A declaration of property from 240 BCE features a deposit of lentils and beans, and a petition from 163 BC refers to a deposit of 1300 copper drachms:

.....]ματα σὺν τῷ κονιορτῷ ἀ(ρτάβαι) ιε, ὄσπρια κυάμου ἀ(ρτάβαι) κγ, ἐρεβίνθου ἀ(ρτάβαι) λε, φακῶν ἀ(ρτάβαι) ζ καὶ ἐμ παρακαταθήκη Πανήσιος φακῶν ἀ(ρτάβαι) γ, φασήλου ἀ(ρτάβαι) ιε, καὶ ἐν τῷ ἐμ Βουβάστῳ βασιλικῷ θησαυρῷ ἀποκάθαρσις τοῦ σίτου τοῦ ἐξενεχθέντος \σίτου/ κριθοπύρου ἀ(ρτάβαι) ρξη, ἐξ οἷ ἐκοσκινεύε[το ὁ] πυρός. (W.Chr. 198, lines 15-20)

14 artabas of ... with dust, 23 artabas of bean-seeds, 35 artabas of chick-peas, 7 artabas of lentils and in deposit of Panesios three artabas of lentils, 15 aratabas of beans, and in the royal treasury of Boubastos a sifting of grain: 168 artabas of full-grown wheatgrass grain, from which the wheat was sifted.

²⁰ Roberts and Turner, *Catalogue*, 16.

ἀδικοῦμαι ὑπὸ Νεφόριτος τῶν ἀπὸ Μέμφεως. τοῦ γὰρ ταύτης θυγατρίου
Ταθήμιος συνδιατρίβοντος ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ, δαιτώμενον δὲ καὶ ἐξ ὧν
ἐλόγευεν διὰ δομάτων, συναγαγούσης δὲ αὐτῆς χα(λκοῦ) Ατ καὶ δούσης
μοι αὐτὰς παραθήκην (UPZ 2, lines 4-9)

I am being wronged by Nephoris, inhabitant of Memphis. Her little daughter Tathemis stays with me in the temple and she is also provided for from the distributions she collects. When she had got together 1,300 bronze drachmas, she gave them to me for safekeeping.²¹

The latter papyrus is a petition drafted by the victim's uncle, Harmais, who lived as a recluse in the temple of Sarapis at Memphis. Harmais had entrusted the girl's mother, Nephoris, with a sum of money for the purpose of clothing her, giving her a dowry, and organising her circumcision, a widespread practice in Ancient and Hellenistic Egypt.²² Harmais and Nephoris agreed that if she failed to do any of these things by a certain date, she would pay him 2400 instead of 1300 drachmas. Nephoris, however, failed to live up to her promises and Harmais had to write a petition to the magistrate to reclaim the girl's money. This is the only papyrus from Hellenistic Egypt that mentions a deposit of money, all other bailments of money were in the form of a δάνειον or a χρῆσις. But the circumstances of the deposit are unusual, since the girl—through her guardian Harmais—entrusts her mother with the money for her own care. In any case, these papyri prove that one could entrust anything—ranging from lentils to cows and copper drachms—to anyone in a deposit.²³

The Bodleian Library holds a small ostrakon from 67 BCE inscribed with an agreement for a deposit, the responsibility for which could be renounced with an oath. Unfortunately the ostrakon breaks off at the end of this fragment:

ὄρκος ὃν δεῖ ὁμόσαι (...) εἰ μὴν ἦν εἶχεν ὁ πατήρ μου συγγραφὴν Αἰγυπτίαν
ἐν παραθήκῃ ταύτῃ τὴν γυναῖκα μου Ζμίθιν ἀποδεδοκέναι Ἀρσινόῃ
Δωρίῳ/νος. ὁμόσαντος αὐτοῦ ἀπολύεσθαι τῆς [συνγρα]φῆς, μὴ
ὀμ[ό]σαντος (O.Bodl. 274, lines 1, 8-15)

the oath which he should swear ... that my father has an Egyptian contract in deposit (with) this wife of mine, Espmetis, to give back to Arsinoe

²¹ Translation by Jane Rowlandson, *Women and Society in Greek and Roman Egypt: A Sourcebook* (Cambridge: Cambridge, University Press, 1998), 100.

²² Compare Philo, *QG* 3.47.

²³ Note the σκεῦη in LXX Exod 22:6; PUG 117 and SB 15462.

daughter of Dorion. When he swears, he will be released from the contract, but if he does not swear ...

From this potsherd, Taubenschlag concluded that “[t]here was probably a provision in the Egyptian law that the depositor, when sued for the restitution of a deposit, had to take an oath if he denied its possession.”²⁴ If it is true that the custom of abjuration from a deposit extended beyond a single ostrakon, this may well have been a contributing factor to the translators’ decision to insert “and he will swear” (καὶ ὁμῆται) in the case of the deposit of Exodus 22:7.

Legal Jargon

From the Hellenistic period there is but one papyrus in which a “loan” (δάνειον) may have been confused with a more general “lending, loan” (χρησις). In 221 BC, a father wrote to a local magistrate to explain how his son had been coerced “to sign a loan contract” (συγγράψασθαι αὐτῇ δανείου P.En-teux. 49, line 5). Later on in the same papyrus, the father, at least according to the editor’s reconstruction, may have referred to the same loan as “a lending of money” ([χρησις] τοῦ ἀργυρίου line 9), but this is nothing more than an editorial guess. Apart from this unlikely anomaly, there are no other papyri extant from the Ptolemaic period that confuse “deposit” (παρακαταθήκη), “loan” (δάνειον), or “lending, loan” (χρησις), even though the precise distinctions between the three words are hard to define. This must mean that the scribes of the papyri chose their words with care and precision, although not with as much precision as the Roman lawyers, as was argued by Simon:

Damit wird stillschweigend erwartet, daß uns aus den Urkunden und sonstigen Zeugnissen des hellenistischen Sprachraums eine juristische Terminologie, das heißt, ein durch den definierenden Juristen stabili-sierter Begriffskosmos, entgegentritt. Was wir jedoch vor uns haben, ist nicht Terminologie—die erst die Römer für ihr Recht geschaffen haben—, sondern ungeprägter Rechtsstoff.²⁵

²⁴ Raphael Taubenschlag, *The Law of Greco-Roman Egypt in the Light of the Papyri* 332 B.C.-640 A.D. (2nd ed.; New York: Herald Square, 1955), 264.

²⁵ Simon, “Quasi-ΠΑΡΑΚΑΤΑΘΗΚΗ,” 64. Compare Hans-Albert Rupprecht, *Kleine Einführung in die Papyruskunde* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1994), 97: “Zu beachten ist weiter, dass griechisches Recht nicht durch Juristen, d.h. durch den römischen Juristen vergleichbare *iuris periti*, bearbeitet wurde. Dem entspricht das Fehlen einer festen juristischen Terminologie als seiner definierten Kunstsprache. Das gilt auch, wenn man berücksichtigt, dass in den Urkunden ein zwar weitgehend üblicher, sogar technischer Sprachgebrauch gepflegt wird, der aber nicht zwingend ist.”

Here is a fundamental difference between the laws of the Hebrew Bible and the laws of Hellenistic Egypt. The biblical law of deposit refers to both the deposit of animate property and to the deposit of inanimate property as מִלְאכָה, even though they are different institutions that incur different responsibilities on owner and guardian. In the Greek documents from Hellenistic Egypt, however, the different institutions bear different labels. This may explain the translators' confusion at the law of deposit, and may be the reason why they—once committed to the translation of “property” (מִלְאכָה) into “deposit” (παρακαταθήκη), blurred the conceptual distinction between deposits of animate and inanimate property in the biblical law of deposit.

The use of παρακαταθήκη is not the only example of legal jargon in the LXX of the law of deposit. Since the verb “to call in” (ἐγκαλέω) occurs frequently in Greek writings, there is nothing inherently strange about its appearance in the Greek translation of v. 8, except that it is unparalleled as a translation of “to say” (אָמַר). When ἐγκαλέω occurs in literature, inscriptions, and papyri, it is almost always in legal contexts, where it acquires the sense of “to accuse” (or, in the case of the passive voice ἐγκαλέομαι, “to be accused”). In Ancient Athens, the verb ἐγκαλέω was used in an even more specific sense: to submit a “written complaint” (ἐγκλημα). Examples of such complaints make an appearance, apparently in their original wording, in the *Orations* of Demosthenes, as in: “Read the accusation itself, which he levels against me” (λέγε δ’ αὐτὸ τὸ ἐγκλημα, ὃ μοι δικάζεται).²⁶ Since many of the papyri from Hellenistic Egypt are of a legal nature, the verb ἐγκαλέω occurs time and time again: approximately 130 times in the Ptolemaic papyri of the Duke Databank. For instance, a transcript of a lawsuit from 119 BCE over the ownership of a house in Thebes—one of the best documented lawsuits from the Ptolemaic period—refers repeatedly to “the accused” (οἱ ἐγκαλούμενοι), “one of the accused” (ἐνὸς τῶν ἐγκαλουμένων), and “the parents of the accused” (οἱ γονεῖς τῶν ἐγκαλουμένων P.Tor.Choach. 11b).²⁷ Perhaps the frequency of the verb ἐγκαλέω in cases of civil law contributed to the translators' rendering of “of which he says” (אֵשֶׁר יֹאמַר) into “of the accused” (τῆς ἐγκαλουμένης) in Exodus 22:8, assuming that the translators' *Vorlage* was similar to the consonantal text of the MT and the SP.

The use of the verb “to act wickedly” (πονηρεύομαι) may be another instance where the LXX echoes contemporary legal documents. Although this

²⁶ Demosthenes, *Or.* 37.22. On the Athenian ἐγκλημα, see Michael Gagarin, *Writing Greek Law* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 113.

²⁷ P.Tor.Choach. 11b, lines 13, 38, 40, 43, 52, 54, 56.

verb, *πονηρεύομαι*, occurs only once in the extant papyri that have been published to date, it does so in a context that is strikingly similar to the context the law of deposit in the LXX. The papyrus mentions an exculpatory oath in the case of a civil lawsuit:

[ἐ]ὰν δέ τις καταβολήσῃ κατά τινος, φάμενος αὐτὸν [ὑπορύ]ξαι ὑπὸ τὴν αὐτοῦ οἰκίαν καὶ ποιῆσαι αὐτὴν [πεσεῖν,] προστάσσεται τῷ καταβοληθέντι [ὁ] μὴ οὐ κατ[α]βολήσαντι εἶ μὴν ὅτι οὐ πονηρεύεσθαι [π]ρὸς τὸ πεσεῖν [P.Oxy. 3285, lines 43-46]

If someone brings charges against someone, saying that he dug a hole under his house and made him fall (in it), it is commanded to the accused to swear to the accuser that he did not act wickedly to the fall.

In addition to the similarity of context, this particular legal text is a Greek translation of an Egyptian text. Although the Greek papyrus itself is dated to the second century CE, the translation was made sometime in the third century BCE, just like the LXX. The Demotic original of the text is the so-called Legal Manual from Hermopolis (partially preserved in P.Mattha), which contains a series of cases that were perhaps meant to aid Egyptian judges in reaching their verdicts.²⁸ Although both this papyrus and the LXX are Greek translations from the third century BCE, the documents differ in the language of their source: Hebrew and Egyptian, they differ in genre: the LXX combines history with legislation and P.Mattha is a legal manual, and they differ in sheer size: the LXX of the Pentateuch counts some 124,530 words²⁹ and the remains of the papyrus just 440.³⁰

Conclusion

Some scholars have attempted to explain the differences between the Hebrew and Greek versions of the law of bailment of Exodus 22:6-14 by referring to rabbinic halakha. At a conceptual level, however, the LXX could hardly be more different from rabbinic halakha, for whereas the rabbis sought to distinguish

²⁸ Girgis Mattha and George R. Hughes, *The Demotic Legal Code of Hermopolis West* (Cairo: Institut français d'archéologie orientale du Caire, 1975); Koen Donker van Heel, *The Legal Manual of Hermopolis* (Leiden: Papyrologisch instituut, 1990).

²⁹ In the edition of Alfred Rahlfs, *Septuaginta: Id est, Vetus Testamentum graece iuxta LXX interpretes* (2 vols.; Stuttgart: Privilegierte württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1935).

³⁰ Joseph Méléze Modrzejewski, "The Septuagint as Nomos: How the Torah Became a 'Civic Law' for the Jews in Egypt," in *Critical Studies in Ancient Law, Comparative Law and Legal History* (ed. J. W. Cairns and O. F. Robinson; Oxford: Hart, 2001), 188-90.

between various types of guardians, the LXX translators seems to have muddled the distinction between the deposit of animate and the deposit of inanimate property. The interpretation of Philo of Alexandria, who assumed that the responsibility for livestock that was torn by a predator could be sworn off, is foreshadowed in the unifying approach to the biblical law of deposit in the LXX.

I have argued that at least some of the differences between the Hebrew and Greek versions of the law can be explained with reference to the more immediate historical and geographical context of the LXX, that is, Hellenistic Egypt. It seems that some words that the translators introduced in the LXX—such as “to act wickedly” (πονηρεῦσθαι) for “to stretch out one’s hand” (יד שלח), “to accuse” (ἐγκαλέω) for “to say” (אמר), and “deposit” (παρακαταθήκη) for “property” (מלאכה)—were part and parcel of the legal jargon of Hellenistic Egypt.

JELLE VERBURG
St John’s College,
Oxford, GB
jelleverburg@gmail.com

Two Selective Greek Texts of Exodus: A Comparative Analysis of Rahlfs 896 and 960

DREW LONGACRE

Abstract

In Biblical Studies there is a growing appreciation for the variety of ways ancient scribes, scholars, and readers selectively used excerpts of Judeo-Christian scriptures in antiquity. In this paper, I will examine materially and textually two fragments with excerpts in Greek from the book of Exodus that contribute to this ongoing discussion. P. Rendel Harris Inv. 54 c = Rahlfs 896 is inscribed only on the front side in an unskilled hand with high dots separating small word groups, which I suggest fits well with an educational context. P. Berlin 13994 = Rahlfs 960 comes from a small codex whose preserved contents suggest a topical collection focusing on Sabbath regulations. These two fragments are particularly interesting objects of comparative study, because they overlap in the passages with which they interact in such a way that we can observe different approaches to selectively appropriating the same sacred scriptures for different purposes. They also provide interesting glimpses into the history of the text of the book of Exodus, once complicating factors relating to their selectivity are taken into account.

Introduction*

The text of Exodus has a long history of being used selectively in both Jewish and Christian tradition. In addition to the broad continuous-text manuscript tradition of the entire book and occasional citations and/or rewritings in the context of other literary works, ancient scribes, scholars, and interested readers frequently transmitted in writing selected portions of the book apart from their full literary context. They commonly preserve long strings of text from Exodus without significant alterations. Nevertheless, the literary contexts in which these texts are preserved differ greatly from those of the continuous-text manuscripts. Their writers first decontextualize and then recontextualize the selected portions of the book for some specific purpose.

Texts primarily from Exodus 12-13 are regularly included in *tefillin* and *mezuzot*, including those from Qumran.¹ 4QDeutⁱ appears to be a small excerpt manuscript containing liturgically significant passages from Deuteronomy and Exodus 12-13.² 4QExod^e also contained excerpts from at least Ex 13, and 4QExod^d contained excerpts from at least chs. 13 and 15—the important Song of the Sea.³ 4Q175 (4QTestimonia) starts with an excerpted passage from a so-called “pre-Samaritan” form of Ex 20:21, followed by excerpts from Numbers, Deuteronomy, and the Apocryphon of Joshua in that order, and it appears to be a compilation thematically organized on the topic of the Messiah(s).⁴ The Nash Papyrus (Cambridge UL MS Or.233) from Egypt contains in Hebrew only a composite version of the ten commandments from Ex 20/Deut 5 and the *shema*‘ from Deut 6.⁵

The selective use of the book of Exodus can also be documented in the Christian manuscript tradition.⁶ The *Odes* incorporate Exodus 15:1-19, and P. Berlin 16158 preserves *Odes* 1:1-2 = Exodus 15:1-2 as a Greek scriptural *incipit* in an amulet from Egypt.⁷ I would suggest that two fragments from Egypt—P. Rendel Harris Inv. 54 c =

* Thanks to Anneli Aejmelaeus, Tuukka Kauhanen, and the members of Team 2 of the University of Helsinki’s Centre of Excellence, “Changes in Sacred Texts and Traditions” for reading and responding to drafts of this article, as well as the anonymous reviewers whose critical engagement helped strengthen many aspects.

¹ Cf. Y. B. Cohn, *Tangled up in Text: Tefillin and the Ancient World*, Brown Judaica Series 351 (Providence, R.I.: Brown University Press, 2008), 55-87.

² J. A. Duncan, “37. 4QDeut^j,” in *Qumran Cave 4, Vol. IX: Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Kings*, ed. E. Ulrich, DJD 14 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995), 75-91, plates XX-XXIII.

³ D. Longacre, “A Contextualized Approach to the Hebrew Dead Sea Scrolls Containing Exodus” (Ph.D. diss., University of Birmingham, 2015), 134-135. On 4QExod^d, see J. E. Sanderson, “15. 4QExod^d,” in *Qumran Cave 4, VII: Genesis to Numbers*, ed. E. Ulrich and F. M. Cross, DJD 12 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994), 127-128, plate XXI, esp. 127; E. Tov, “The Biblical Texts from the Judaean Desert—An Overview and Analysis of the Published Texts,” in *The Bible as Book: The Hebrew Bible and the Judaean Desert Discoveries*, ed. E. D. Herbert and E. Tov (London: British Library, 2002), 139-166, esp. 149. On 4QExod^e, see J. E. Sanderson, “16. 4QExod^e,” in *Qumran Cave 4, VII: Genesis to Numbers*, ed. E. Ulrich and F. M. Cross, DJD 12 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994), 129-131, plate XXI, esp. 130; Tov, “Biblical Texts,” 163 n. 140; A. Lange, *Handbuch der Textfunde vom Toten Meer. Band 1: Die Handschriften biblischer Bücher von Qumran und den anderen Fundorten* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009), 61.

⁴ Z. Talshir, “Are the Biblical Texts from Qumran Biblical? 4QTestimonia and the Minimalists,” *Megillot* 5-6 (2008), 119-140.

⁵ Cf. G. D. Martin, *Multiple Originals: New Approaches to Hebrew Bible Textual Criticism*, SBLTCS 7 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2010), 205-236.

⁶ For a recent survey of the broader phenomenon of excerpting texts from Greco-Roman literature, see S. Morlet, ed., *Lire en extraits: Lecture et production des textes, de l'Antiquité à la fin du Moyen Âge* (Paris: PU Paris-Sorbonne, 2015).

⁷ J. E. Sanzo, *Scriptural Incipits on Amulets from Late Antique Egypt: Text, Typology, and Theory*, Studien und Texte zu Antike und Christentum 84 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014), 131-132.

Rahlfs 896 and P. Berlin 13994 = Rahlfs 960—provide further examples of the selective appropriation of passages from Exodus in newly written texts in Greek-speaking Christian circles. Transcriptions and notes for each fragment can be found in the appendix at the end of this article.

Analysis of P. Rendel Harris Inv. 54 c = Rahlfs 896

P. Rendel Harris Inv. 54 c = Rahlfs 896 of the Cadbury Research Library at the University of Birmingham was published by Manfredo Manfredi in 1985.⁸ It was not included in Wevers' edition of the Greek Exodus, which was published six years later in 1991.⁹ I had the opportunity to examine the papyrus in person in the Cadbury Research Library on 24-25 February 2015, and Catherine Martin kindly provided me with digital scans of both recto and verso at 400 dpi.¹⁰ The manuscript is preserved in one extant papyrus fragment of unknown provenance, measuring 17.0 cm in height by 12.5 cm in width between its maximally preserved edges. There is heavy deterioration on all the edges entirely around the fragment and frequently within the outline of the preserved material.

This papyrus is significant in a number of respects. First, it is inscribed in two columns only on the front (→) side, suggesting that it was either a loose sheet or constructed in a (sc)roll format. The latter format would be uncommon among the preserved Greek Exodus fragments and could suggest a Jewish provenance.¹¹ Nevertheless, for reasons discussed below, I suspect 896

⁸ M. Manfredi, "166. LXX Exodus 22-23," in *The Rendel Harris Papyri of Woodbrooke College, Birmingham, Volume II*, Studia Amstelodamensia ad epigraphicam, ius antiquum et papyrologicam pertinentia XXVI (Zutphen, the Netherlands: Terra Publishing, 1985), 1-5, plate I.

⁹ J. W. Wevers, *Exodus*, Septuaginta—Vetus Testamentum Graecum, Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis editum (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991). This edition will provide the basis for the textual notes in this paper.

¹⁰ Note that the collection has been moved from the Orchard Learning Resource Centre (the location still listed in the official online Göttingen *Verzeichnis* as of December 2012, <http://demo.multivio.org/client/#get&url=http://rep.adw-goe.de//bitstream/handle/11858/00-001S-0000-0022-A30C-8/Rahlfs-Sigeln_Stand_Dezember_2012.pdf?sequence=1%3E>, accessed 29 June 2016) to the Cadbury Research Library on the main campus of the University of Birmingham.

¹¹ Manfredi, "LXX Exodus," 1. There are no opportunities in the preserved text to determine how the scribe treated the *nomina sacra*. Of the Greek Old Testament manuscripts in (sc)roll format listed in L. W. Hurtado, *The Earliest Christian Artifacts: Manuscripts and Christian Origins* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006), appendix 1, only four abbreviate the *nomina sacra* (P. Oxy. 1166 = Ra 944; P. Oxy. 1075 = Ra 909; P. Lond. Lit. 207? = Ra 2019;

probably never was a roll containing the entire book of Exodus, but was rather a single loose sheet of papyrus. Second, it is dated by Manfredi to the middle of the 3rd century CE, making it one of our earliest Greek fragments of Exodus.

Significantly, 896 consistently has high dots between small word groups (mostly verbs, nouns, and pronouns with associated articles, conjunctions, and prepositions), suggesting an educational or liturgical context where it would be helpful for readers to have the text segmented into small, meaningful strings of text.¹² The fact that the dots are inserted without additional space between the letters suggests that they may have been added after the copying of the main text. Manfredi also notes that the hand is relatively unskilled,¹³ which would be particularly suitable to an educational or informal context. While clearly not a novice hand, several letters appear laboriously and inconsistently formed, the script is somewhat large (average bilinear letter height of 4 mm), and the lines are often crooked and unevenly spaced.

But beyond its physical characteristics, its text is entirely unique. The preserved text is clearly lacking three large segments of text. After 22:27 the scribe left half a line blank and began the next line with καὶ χ[ρ]εα' of 22:31, lacking the entirety of 22:28-31a. After οὐκ εση' μετα πολλων' [ἐπι κακια·] of 23:2, the scribe continued (apparently without leaving blank space) with the beginning of 23:14 at the start of the next line, lacking 23:2b-13. And after [ἐξ Αἰ]γυπτου'

P. Alex. Inv. 203? = Ra 850). Many other literary rolls contain Christian works, according to Hurtado (P. Oxy. 4706; P. Berlin 5513; P. Oxy. 405; P. Jena Inv. 18 + 21; P. Dura 10; P. Iand. 5.70; PSI 11.1200; P. Oxy. 412; P. Ryl. 3.469; P. Berlin 9794; P. Oxy. 2070; P. Mich. 18.764; P. Mich. 18.763; P. Lond. Lit. 228; P. Med. Inv. 71.84; P. Mich. 18.766; P. Strasb. Inv. 1017; P. Laur. 4.140?; P. Oxy. 655; P. Oxy. 3525; P. Oxy. 2949?; P. Vind. G 2325; P. Fay. 2?; P. Vind. G 29 456r + 29 828r).

¹² Manfredi, "LXX Exodus," 2. Hurtado, *Earliest Christian Artifacts*, 210, labels the dots reading marks. He notes also P. Lond. Lit. 207 (= Ra 2019) and P. Laur. 4.140 as having syllable division marks and relates them possibly to educational contexts. He also notes PSI Inv. 1989 (= Ra 2122) as having sense-unit marks. E. G. Turner and P. J. Parsons, *Greek Manuscripts of the Ancient World* (2nd ed.; Bulletin Supplement 46; London: Institute of Classical Studies, 1987), 7-8, 144-145 discuss some literary texts with division into word groups or clauses, which they suppose is intended to facilitate the reading of dramatic texts by performers or biblical texts by public readers. Raffaella Cribiore, *Writing, Teachers, and Students in Graeco-Roman Egypt* (American Studies in Papyrology 36; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996), 48-49, 87, lists numerous parallel examples of oblique strokes separating word groups in school texts, concluding that such division "is rarely present in Greek texts other than exercises" (p. 48) and that "When the words or word groups ... in a well written text are consistently separated, usually by oblique dashes, it is very likely that the text in question was a book used in school for reading" (p. 49).

¹³ Manfredi, "LXX Exodus," 1.

of 23:15, the scribe left a short interval blank and then appears to have continued on the same line with [και εορτην συντε] of 23:16, lacking 23:15b-16a.

Each of these three large minuses could potentially be explained by homoioteleuton (ειμι \cap μοι; πολλων \cap υμων; Αι]γυπτου \cap σου). The unskilled hand and frequent mistakes in the preserved text could support this suggestion (cf. 22:31 $\epsilon\eta\rho[i]\alpha\lambda\omega\tau\alpha$ for $\theta\eta\rho\iota\alpha\lambda\omega\tau\alpha$; 23:1 $\gamma\epsilon\nu\epsilon\sigma\theta\epsilon$ for $\gamma\epsilon\nu\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$; 23:1 ρ is written over an incorrect υ in $\mu\alpha\rho\tau\upsilon\varsigma$). The size and frequency of the minuses, however, suggests that the differences are not to be explained as accidental omissions. The intentionality of the shorter texts may also be supported by the fact that all three large minuses occur in 896 at section breaks visually marked with blank space and/or by beginning a new section at the left margin.¹⁴ Furthermore, the closest passage that the unidentified ink traces from the first column could possibly be identified with is 22:8 (if the first column indeed contained text from Exodus). If this identification is correct, it would require a column height reconstructed according to other known witnesses at approximately 70-75 lines, which is obviously far more than is physically plausible (this would make the inscribed columns approximately 50 cm in height). This strongly suggests that a large quantity of text from 22:8-26 was also lacking in 896.

As Manfredi mentions, it is very difficult to explain why so many long sections are lacking in 896 from a literary point of view.¹⁵ First, it should be noted that it is most improbable that 896 reflects an earlier literary stage in the growth of the book of Exodus. The shorter texts occur with a regularity that cannot be explained as early forms secondarily supplemented in the rest of the tradition. Furthermore, if the lack of these texts reflected an early stage of the development of the book, no redactor would have inserted the new texts as they occur in the other witnesses. The contents of the first missing passage (22:28-31a) are completely unrelated to the surrounding context, without anything to prompt such an interpolation. The second missing passage (23:2b-13) at first continues the context of impartiality in bearing witness and resisting the sinful majority, but quickly shifts to other unrelated discussions. The third missing passage (23:15b-16a) is problematic, because even the short text of 896 says that there are three appointed feasts, whereas 896 apparently lists only two. The fact that it also lacks the final phrase relating to the feast of unleavened bread in 23:15 (viz. "No one shall appear before me empty-handed") makes it clear that the command to observe the festival of harvest was not simply added or repositioned in the other witnesses against a short base

¹⁴ So also A. Rahlfs and D. Fraenkel, *Verzeichnis der griechischen Handschriften des Alten Testaments. Bd. 1,1: Die Überlieferung bis zum VIII. Jahrhundert* (Septuaginta Vetus Testamentum Graecum Auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis editum Supplementum 1,1; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004), 44.

¹⁵ Manfredi, "LXX Exodus," 3-4.

text like 896. Thus, we can confidently conclude that 896 must have been derived from the full, continuous running text of the book of Exodus as known from other witnesses.

That said, there is no obvious thematic explanation for the shorter text of 896. 22:28 and 23:13 speak of other gods, which could have potentially prompted omissions for theological reasons, but this explanation cannot account for much of the omitted text in all three sections. If 896 was written in a Christian context, it would be understandable why references to animal sacrifice, Sabbaths, and Jewish festivals might be omitted, but this does not explain much of the omitted text or the fact that two festivals were included. It is also difficult to imagine what thematic purpose would be served by omitting the second half of 23:2, which is essentially a restatement of the first half. Nor do the omitted sections entail clearly defined literary units, frequently crossing over natural literary boundaries. There does not seem to be any one compelling literary explanation for why all of these sections would have been omitted.

If we examine not the omitted texts, but the included texts, the picture is not much clearer. The preserved text has no thematic continuity and inadequate transitions. Furthermore, 896 lacks even basic coherence, since it omits one of the three feasts, while still requiring observation of all three. The passages included would not be expected to be particularly prominent in either Jewish or Christian liturgical or homiletical contexts, wherein the omitted sections would actually probably be more fitting. I can only conclude that there does not seem to be any organizing literary principle justifying an intentional compilation of Exodus texts.

Instead, the creator of the short text of 896 seems to have proceeded sequentially through at least this portion of the book of Exodus, regularly omitting sections rather arbitrarily for reasons other than literary content. This seems to me to fit well with an educational context, where a student would have been expected to copy out substantial, near-contiguous excerpts of the book of Exodus. Copying excerpts of literary masterpieces is a well-known feature of Ancient Near Eastern and Greco-Roman scribal training. The teacher presumably would have marked out which texts to copy and which to omit from a copy of the book of Exodus or, perhaps even more likely, created a new selective text on a model to be copied and read by students. The unskilled hand of 896, the unusual format, and the secondary dots dividing word groups would also fit

well with this explanation of 896 as a school text, and 896 is more likely to be the copy of an intermediate-level student than the teacher's exemplar.¹⁶

In its preserved text, 896 is characteristically a very good witness to the Old Greek (OG), as reconstructed by Wevers. There is practically no evidence of revision towards a Hebrew text. Its four sensible singular readings (apart from the large lacking passages) all probably reflect inner-Greek corruption.

22:27 τοῦτο 2° A] > 896(vid) (According to the reconstructed space, 896 appears to disagree with the Masoretic text = MT; cf. the same error in the minuscule 126 at τοῦτο 1°)

22:27 πρὸς με] προς εμε 896; *adversus te* Lat^{cod} 103; + ζητων 59

22:31 τῷ A] + δε 896 (896 disagrees with the MT, but the conjunction is natural to smooth out the transition)

22:31 ἀπορρίψατε] -ψετε (c var) A F^b 15-58 b 107' 56 127 t 392 120'-128' 646 Co Syh; -ψεσθε 767; ριψετε 126; ἀποριψεται 896 (896 disagrees with the MT, but is phonologically similar to the OG)

In one case 896 seems basically to agree with ὁ ἑβρ' and the Syrohexapla in the addition of an awkward possessive pronoun found in the Hebrew, which is the best plausible evidence for revision towards a Hebrew text, though in itself quite meager.

22:27 ἰμάτιον] + αὐτω 896; + (※ Syh) αὐτου (bis scr 376) 15-376 Syh, cf. ὁ ἑβρ' + αὐτοῦ Syh^{txt}

In shared readings, 896 seems to agree most closely with 707 of the *oII* group (an excellent source of hexaplaric material) and 127 of the *n* group. In three interrelated readings, it consistently reads the plural in agreement with 72-707-767, *n*⁻⁴⁵⁸, and Bo (with scattered agreement in other witnesses, particularly of the *O* group) against the singular of the Masoretic text (MT) and Wevers' reconstruction of the OG.

22:31 κρέας A] κρεα 896 O⁻³⁷⁶-15-707 73 44' 129 n 130 Bo; *quidquam* Sa

¹⁶ Cribiore, *Writing*, 49, notes at least two examples of such student copies with marked word division—T.BM GR 1906.10-20.2 and P.Leiden inv. 17—alongside a larger number of teachers' exemplars. Interestingly, among the latter is the 7th century wooden tablet P.Vat.gr. 56 (= Ra 2176), which includes Psalm 28 and part of Psalm 29 according to the Septuagint, showing the use of the Greek scriptures in a Christian educational context. The similar use of scriptural excerpts for educational purposes is also well-documented in the rabbinic literature and Cairo Geniza documents; see J. Olszowy-Schlanger, "Learning to Read and Write in Medieval Egypt: Children's Exercise Books from the Cairo Geniza," *Journal of Semitic Studies* 48, no. 1 (2003): 47-69.

22:31 θηριάλωτον **¶** pr (※ Syh) εν τω (> *f* Compl) αγρω 15-58-376 *f*^{-56*} 318 Syh = Compl, cf. σ' θ' + ἐν τῷ ἀγρῷ Syh^{txt}; θηριοβρωτον F^b; -λωτα 896 (with spelling error) 72-707-767 *n*⁻⁴⁵⁸ Bo; -λω^τ 458; + (※ Arm^{ms}) *in agro* Arm

22:31 αὐτό F F^b **¶** αυτω 376 551 106-125' 619 318 319* 799; αυτα 896 F^a O⁻³⁷⁶-707 *n* 527 Bo; > 44 Arm

It is not impossible that the plural readings actually reflect the true OG in these cases. The Hebrew singular רָשָׁרָשׁ is consistently translated with the plural of *κρέας* elsewhere in the Septuagint of Exodus in reference to the flesh of animals to be eaten,¹⁷ and there is a tendency in the Greek tradition to change these plurals into singulars. Furthermore, while the *n* and *O* groups are fairly closely related¹⁸ and the Boharic has heavy hexaplaric influence, 896 (unknown to Wevers) makes a strong case for the pre-hexaplaric nature of these readings. In most cases, 896 does not follow hexaplaric readings, and in these cases, neither the *O* and *n* groups, 707, nor 896 add the phrase under the asterisk εν τω αγρω into their main texts. If the plural readings reflect the OG, then they have little to say about the relationship between 896 and the *O* and *n* groups, except that they both preserve an old text for this passage. If the plurals are indeed secondary, however, they may suggest genetic relationships between these manuscripts; possibly Origen used an old Egyptian text for his Septuagint column.

Four other shared readings only serve to reinforce this general profile.

22:27 αὐτοῦ 1°] αυτω (-το 610 318 799 Phil 224^{ap}) 896(vid) 767-*oI* C'' 107'-125 127 85^{txt}-130-321-343' *y*⁻⁵²⁷ 128'-628 59 426 646' Phil III 224 226 228; αυ^τ 458; > 75

23:2 πλειόνων 1°] πολλων 896 707-767 *b n* 527 Phil II 175 280 Chr VII 186 XIV 266 Clem I 252 (sed hab Compl); ^2° 72 318

23:14 ἐορτάσατέ (-ται 319) B 58 52'-73 44' 53-56*-246 *n*⁻¹²⁷ 84 *x* 527 120'-122-128* 18 46 59 76' 426 Cyr *Ad* 1064 Or *Sel* 293] εορταζετε 551 = Compl; inc 664; -σετε (c var) 896 ^{Lat}Hi *Agg* I 1 *Gal* II 3 rell

23:15 τὸν καιρόν] των καιρων 618 44* 128; om τόν 896 707 127

¹⁷ Cf. J. W. Wevers, *Notes on the Greek Text of Exodus* (Septuagint and Cognate Studies 30; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990), 357.

¹⁸ J. W. Wevers, *Text History of the Greek Exodus* (Mitteilungen des Septuaginta-Unternehmens XXI; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1992), 36, 63. I would particularly note that 707 shares many of the distinctive (even dittographic, e.g., 33:7 σκηνη σκηνη) additions of the Byzantine groups (*d n t*) that Wevers discusses on p. 59 (see, e.g., 22:14; 25:36; 29:1; 30:15, 16; 35:24; 36:13).

The probable reading *αυτω* in 22:27 is in agreement with an old Egyptian reading popular among the hexaplaric witnesses and may well go back to the Old Greek. The reading *πολλων* in 23:2 reflects a more literal translation of the Hebrew רַבִּים, which could suggest inconsistent revision towards the Hebrew. Nevertheless, since *πλειόνων* is used later in the verse in all extant witnesses, it is possible that the original translator varied his terminology intentionally to avoid redundancy. At very least the agreement of 896, Philo, and Clement of Alexandria suggests that *πολλων* was an old Egyptian reading, and it should be noted that 896 agrees once again with 707 and the *n* group. 896 reads the future indicative with the majority of manuscripts (including 707 and 127, the latter against the rest of the *n* group) against the aorist imperative in 23:14. Wevers suggests the OG read the imperative, possibly under the influence of *φυλάξασθε* in 23:13.¹⁹ In that case, the future would either reflect revision towards the Hebrew or phonological confusion within the Greek tradition. Nevertheless, it is equally possible that the future indicative was the original translation, since the Septuagint translates with the future *ἐορτάσετε* twice in the other two similar contexts in 12:14 and has a tendency to vary between imperative and future indicative. Either way, the corruption is probably inner-Greek and likely occurred multiple times independently in the tradition. The lack of the article before *καιρόν* in 23:15 also agrees with 707 and 127, and though the Hebrew construct noun also does not have an article at this point, none of these manuscripts agrees with the Hebrew texts for the entire construct chain. Undoubtedly secondary, this reading may perhaps have been created multiple times independently, but the agreement of 896 with 707 and 127 in other possibly secondary readings in other variation units decreases the likelihood of coincidental agreement in this case. Whatever the precise relationship of 896 with 707 and 127, at least it can confidently be said that 896 agrees most closely with these two manuscripts.

To sum up the textual character of the preserved text of 896, it is a very good witness to the OG text, with a few singular readings reflecting inner-Greek corruption and occasional agreements with members of the *O* and *n* groups against Wevers. In these latter cases, 896 most consistently agrees with 707 and 127.

¹⁹ Wevers, *Notes*, 365.

Analysis of P. Berlin 13994 = Rahlfs 960

P. Berlin 13994 = Rahlfs 960 was published by Otto Stegmüller in 1939.²⁰ I had the opportunity to examine the manuscript in person in the *Ägyptisches Museum und Papyrussammlung* of the Staatliche Museen zu Berlin on 23 December 2014.²¹ It is dated by Stegmüller to the 5th-6th centuries CE, and by Cavallo and Maehler more precisely to the middle or latter half of the 6th century CE.²² 960 is preserved in one extant parchment fragment of a bifolium, measuring approximately 8.5 cm in height by 9.5 cm in width, preserving a substantial proportion of one leaf and a small, unscribed portion of the innermost margins of the opposite leaf. There is evidence of folding and stitching between the two folia. Written on both front and back, the manuscript can be reconstructed as a small, well-prepared codex with one column per page of about 18 lines. The writing block would have measured approximately 11 cm in height by 8 cm in width, and the entire closed codex approximately 12 cm x 9 cm.²³ While Stegmüller argues that the high quality preparation of the parchment suggests a Bible codex, at the reconstructed dimensions, the rest of Exodus alone would have required over 300 pages, making the book nearly as thick as it was wide. The infeasibility of this reconstruction suggests instead that 960 never contained the continuous running text of the entire book of Exodus in any textual form. The late date, (inconsistent) abbreviation of *nomina sacra*, and codex format all suggest a Christian origin for 960.²⁴ Additionally, 960 exhibits regular punctuation with high dots between sentences.

One of the most distinctive features of 960 is the complete lack of Exodus 23:14-31:11. On the front side of the inscribed leaf it reads the continuous text of Exodus 23:10-12. On the back, however, the text of 23:12-13 runs to the end of a line and is followed by Exodus 31:12-13 on the following line without

²⁰ O. Stegmüller, *Berliner Septuagintafragmente* (Berliner Klassikertexte 8; Berlin: Weidmannsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1939), 10-15, plate II.

²¹ Thanks especially to Marius Gerhardt for his hospitality during my visit and subsequent comments on the readings of the papyrus. The fragment had been thought to have been lost (as still stated in the December 2012 online Göttingen *Verzeichnis*), but has since been located again. As of the last time I checked (28 June 2016), the fragment had not yet been digitally photographed and uploaded on the museum website.

²² G. Cavallo and H. Maehler, *Greek Bookhands of the Early Byzantine Period: A.D. 300 – 800* (Bulletin Supplement 47; London: Institute of Classical Studies, 1987), 84-85.

²³ Stegmüller, *Berliner Septuagintafragmente*, 10.

²⁴ Furthermore, Cavallo and Maehler, *Greek Bookhands*, 84, note that the type of script found in 960 was typically used for Coptic manuscripts or Greek-Coptic diglots. This possible association would also argue for a Christian context.

any evident visual marks or blank space. Only the right margin is preserved, so it is possible that there was some visual indication of the jump from chapter 23 to chapter 31 in the now-lost left margin, but reconstruction requires the placement of the beginning of 31:12 at the left margin.

Stegmüller insightfully notes, however, that there is a dicolon that seems to be misplaced at the end of the line before the last line of 23:13 after *μη ακουσ[θ]ησονται*.²⁵ Stegmüller is almost certainly correct that this punctuation mark is misplaced, since this is not the end of the sentence and there is no punctuation at the end of the sentence, both contrary to the normal pattern of punctuation in the manuscript. But he does not draw any inferences from this conclusion for the nature of the arrangement of the text. The erroneous placement of the punctuation mark probably implies that the punctuation was inserted after the text was initially copied. If the copyist had been inserting punctuation as he wrote or copying it from a correct exemplar, he would have been unlikely to misplace the mark, since *σου* would have been the last word he had written before writing the dicolon. Thus, the punctuation was probably added either by the original copyist or a later punctuator *after* the text had been copied with its shift from 23:13 to 31:12. It should also be noted that this punctuation mark is a dicolon, rather than the high dot normally separating sentences in this fragment. It may very well have been intended to mark a more significant section break, suggesting that either the copyist or a later reader recognized a major literary break in the text at this point.

To analyze this arrangement, we must first consider whether or not it could preserve an arrangement earlier than the other preserved witnesses. Exodus 23:10-13 gives laws requiring rest from God's people. 23:10-11 requires them to leave their fields fallow for one out of every seven years, and 23:12 requires them to rest from their work on the seventh day of each week. 23:13 is a concluding exhortation to obey these commands and not to call on other gods. Exodus 31:12-17 concludes a long, detailed passage commanding the construction of the tabernacle with a command to keep the Sabbath perpetually, before Moses descends from Mt. Sinai. The topical arrangement in 960 focusing on periods of rest—particularly the Sabbath—is self-evident. Nevertheless, in 960, the Sabbath laws are separated by the summary statement in 23:13 that only makes sense in the context of the arrangement of the book of Exodus known from our other witnesses. In other words, the presence of 23:13 in 960 implies a secondary derivation from the expected arrangement of the book, and 960 should not be considered a witness to early source material of the book of

²⁵ Stegmüller, *Berliner Septuagintafragmente*, 12.

Exodus or to an earlier, topical arrangement of the legal material within the book. This can be further corroborated by the implausibility that a later redactor would have separated these Sabbath laws and placed them in their contexts in known texts of the book of Exodus.

If the arrangement in 960 is derived from the general structure of the book essentially known from all other witnesses, then why did the text come to be arranged in this way? Accidental omission of such a large quantity of text as 23:14-31:11 in the middle of the book is completely implausible. Intentional omission in a copy of Exodus is hardly more plausible, since a text without the festivals, promises about entering the land, covenant ratification, and tabernacle could hardly still have a claim to represent a version of the book of Exodus, especially in such a late period. One of the Sabbath laws could have been relocated or duplicated adjacent to the other, but this would make it difficult to explain the intervening 23:13. The reconstruction of the small codex further mitigates against all of these possibilities.

More likely, 960 reflects the work of a compiler collecting topically related legislation regarding periods of rest.²⁶ The compiler (either the scribe of 960 or a predecessor) appears to have searched sequentially through the book of Exodus for references pertaining at least to the Sabbath, since the two passages included appear in the same order as they occur in Exodus (cf. Sabbath regulations in 16:23-30; 20:8-11; 23:12-13; 31:13-17; 34:21; 35:1-3). He transferred complete literary units from Exodus to his new compilation (retaining even parts of the narrative framework), decontextualizing and recontextualizing them by simple juxtaposition, apparently without making any other major modifications to the text or removing disruptive wording to smooth out the transitions. With the present state of the evidence, it is impossible to determine what the other contents of this small codex would have been, but the selective nature of the juxtaposition of 23:10-13 and 31:12-13 is clear. Unfortunately, there is insufficient evidence to reconstruct the social context in which such a compilation would have been constructed and used.

In addition to its selective character, 960 is also textually very interesting. Stegmüller argued based on several Hebraizing readings that 960 was an independent translation from a Hebrew text similar to, but sometimes different

²⁶ Rahlfs and Fraenkel, *Verzeichnis*, 32, note that Bickermann considered it a liturgical collection, but suggest alternatively that it could have been a school text. J. van Haelst, *Catalogue des papyrus littéraires juifs et chrétiens* (Papyrologie 1; Paris: Publications de la Sorbonne, 1976), 38, wonders whether it may have been a lectionary.

from—and possibly even earlier than—the MT. Despite its many distinctive features, however, the sometimes peculiar verbal agreement between 960 and the OG suggests instead a text based essentially on a Septuagint source text.²⁷ Some representative examples suggesting dependence on the OG include:

23:11 ἀφα[ισιν] ποιησις· και ανεσ[εις αυ]την·

23:11 τα δε] ὑπολιπομεν[α εδε]ται τα θηρια τρο[υ αγρου

23:12 και ο π[ροσηλ]υτος

31:12 Και ελα]λησεν κς̄

31:13 εσ]τιν γαρ σημειον

The textual character of 960 is quite unique. It is not a particularly good witness to the OG, usually only agreeing with Wevers' text when joined by most manuscripts. Nor does it closely align with any other manuscripts. It seems to agree once in a Hebraizing revision (against Aquila) with several manuscripts with which it is not otherwise particularly close.

23:11 τὰ ἄγρια] της γης 126; του αγρου 960(vid)²⁸ F^b z 424 426 646 Arm Syh = 𐤀𐤋 (formally equivalent to the MT); cf. α' (inc 707; + τα 85-130-344) ζῶα τῆς χώρας M 707 14-57'-422-500-552 85'(s nom)-130-344 18 646

In two relatively innocuous details, 960 agrees with 53.

23:11 δὲ ὑπολειπόμενα] υπολελειμμενα δε 509; δε υπολιπ. B* 960 53' (itacism); δε υπολελειμμενα 68'-120' 424; om δέ 551

23:12 ἡμέρας] -ραις 960 53 628 (dative of time, rather than accusative of time); -ραι 458

Neither of these cases suggest revision towards any Hebrew texts. Furthermore, since 53 departs from the rest of the *f* group in both cases, these are likely simply to be parallel linguistic changes coincidentally preserved in 960 and 53.

960 agrees with 799 on two probable Hebraizing revisions.

23:13 comma] pr και 960 799 Aeth Arab Bo^A = 𐤀𐤋 (addition of conjunction in agreement with the MT); > 77

31:13 σύνταξον] pr λαλησον και 646; λαλησον M^{mg} 960 O⁻³⁷⁶-29'-707¹ C^{''(-54)} b d f⁻¹²⁹ n⁽⁻⁴⁵⁸⁾ 30'-85^{txt}-130^{txt}-321^{txt}-343-344^{txt} t 527 318' 46 424 509

²⁷ Cf. Rahlfs and Fraenkel, *Verzeichnis*, 32.

²⁸ Wevers does not cite 960 in support of this reading, but the reading is sufficiently well-preserved for inclusion. See the transcription in the appendix.

799 ^{Lat}cod 100 Arab Arm Bo Syh = \mathfrak{H} (probable hexaplaric revision towards the MT²⁹); λαλησεις 376; ταξον 59

The first of these variants, however, is very minor, and provides scant evidence either for revision towards the MT or a close relationship between 960 and 799. The second is a clear agreement in a secondary reading in agreement with the MT, but it is a popular variant, and so does not argue strongly for a close relationship between these two manuscripts.

960 also agrees twice with both n^{458} and 527 in probable revisions towards the MT and once with n^{458} and 767.

23:13 ὑμῶν = Tar] σου 960 n 527 ^{Lat}Tert *Idol* 20 = \mathfrak{H} Sam (possibly revision towards the MT)

31:13 σύνταξον] pr λαλησον και 646; λαλησον M^{mg} 960 *O*⁻³⁷⁶-29'-707^l *C*^{''(-54)} *b* *d* *f*⁻¹²⁹ $n^{(-458)}$ 30'-85^{txt}-130^{txt}-321^{txt}-343-344^{txt} *t* 527 318' 46 424 509 799 ^{Lat}cod 100 Arab Arm Bo Syh = \mathfrak{H} (probable hexaplaric revision towards the MT); λαλησεις 376; ταξον 59

31:13 φυλάξεσθε A B F^b M 381' 739 19-108^c 106 56-129 *s*^{-30 130*} *t*⁻⁸⁴ 527 *y* ^{Lat}Iren IV 16.1] -σθαι 108* 30-130*; -ξασθαι 64*-82-376 246 319 509 Aeth Arm Sa; -ξησθε 71'; -ξατε (-ξατ(αι) 960) 960 767 n^{458} (φυλαξατ(αι) in 960 is probably a phonological error for φυλαξατε, which is an inner-Greek corruption); -ξειτε 458; φυλασσεσθε 55; -ξασθε ^{Lat}Hi *Ezech* VI 20 rell

The first does provide an interesting case of agreement in a secondary reading and likely reflects Hebraizing revision. The second is a popular Hebraizing reading, so it does not necessarily indicate a close relationship between these manuscripts. Furthermore, 527 is part of the *y* group until 28:7, and then changes to the *x* group from 28:8, so the two readings are from parts of 527 with different textual characters. The reading φυλαξατ(αι) in 31:13 in essential agreement with 767 and n^{458} is also interesting in that it reflects a relatively distinctive inner-Greek corruption. Thus, while it is highly improbable that these readings betray a close relationship between 960 and either 527 or 767, it could be said that 960 may very well have loose affinities with the *n* group, a slightly aberrant branch of the Byzantine tradition with a penchant for Hebraizing revisions against the majority of the Byzantine tradition.³⁰

The singular readings of 960 are even more illuminating of its textual character, if not its relationships to other manuscripts. 960 is replete with careless

²⁹ Wevers, *Text History*, 512, says that this revision is pre-hexaplaric, but the witnesses evidence strong hexaplaric influence.

³⁰ Cf. Wevers, *Text History*, 46, 57, who lists eight relatively clear examples of near-unique *n*-group Hebraizing readings against the rest of the Byzantine witnesses.

itacisms, misspellings, and nonsense readings. Some meaningful singular readings may simply be inner-Greek corruptions:

23:11 τὸν ἀμπελῶνά **¶** [τοῖς ἀμ]πελουσιν 960 = Sam | τὸν ἐλαιῶνά **¶** ^{mss} [τοῖς] ελαιουσιν 960 = **¶** ^{mss} Sam; om τόν A (the dative plurals agree with the Samaritan Pentateuch = SP against the MT, though some MT manuscripts read the plural for the latter variation unit; the change could be inner-Greek or a revision towards a Hebrew text like the SP³¹)

23:12 τὰ ἔργα **¶** pr *omnia* Aeth; το ἐργο[ν] 960 (the singular has no documented Hebrew support and is likely inner-Greek corruption)

23:13 ἀναμνησθήσεσθε, οὐδὲ μὴ ἀκουσθῇ 4Q11 **¶** [αν]αμνησις ουδε [μη ακουσ]θήσονται 960 = Sam (4Q11, the MT, and the OG read plural, then singular, while the SP and 960 read singular, then plural; 960 may have arrived at the same reading as the SP coincidentally via inner-Greek changes or else reflects revision towards a Hebrew text like the SP)

31:12 πρὸς **¶** μετα 960 (no Hebrew witnesses read **πρ**, and the change is probably inner-Greek; it is also unlikely that a reviser would have changed the preposition and left ἐλάλησεν)³²

Other singular readings reflect different translation equivalents:

23:11 ἔθλους] λαου 960 (λαός is the expected translation equivalent for **עַם** in Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion;³³ cf. Exod 15:14; Deut 2:21; 4:19; 7:19; 32:8, 21)

23:13 ἐτέρων **¶** αλλοτριων 960 (the change from ἕτερος to ἀλλότριος is also seen in reference to pagan deities in Exod 34:14 in *b* and the Complutensian edition and in Deut 6:14 in 392 and the apparatus to the edition of Theodoretus Cyrensis' *Quaestiones in Deuteronomium*)³⁴

A number of other singular readings seem to demonstrate processes of revision towards a Hebrew text:

³¹ Cf. Hempel, "Review," 123.

³² Contra Stegmüller, *Berliner Septuagintafragmente*, 12-13.

³³ J. Reider and N. Turner, *An Index to Aquila* (Leiden: Brill, 1966), 66.146.

³⁴ Similarly, J. Hempel, "Review of Stegmüller, *Berliner Septuagintafragmente*," *ThLZ* 65 (1940), 122-123, esp. 123. Contra Stegmüller, *Berliner Septuagintafragmente*, 12, who proposes a Hebrew reading נָכַר. Cf. the addition of ἀλλοτρίους to θεούς at 22:28 in 58' ^{Lat}cod 103 Fil CXLVII 1 and the frequent translation with ἀλλότριος, e.g. Deut 31:18, 20; 1 Kgs 9:9; Hos 3:1; Jer 1:16; et al, in which the reverse change to ἕτερος is also occasionally evidenced.

23:12 ἀναπαύσῃ] -σις (-σις 30) B 82 30'-85-343' = Ra; -σεις 120'; σαββατισ[εις] 960 (σαββατισ[εις] could reflect the use of the verb σαββατιζω elsewhere in the OG, but it is probably a revision towards תבבס of the MT and SP; so also Aquila in Lev 25:2); + σαββατα $\overline{\alpha\omega}$ τω $\theta\overline{\omega}$ σου 19' (sed hab Compl): cf. 20:10, where 120^c reads σαββατησεις

23:13 εἶρηκα] -κας 108* (sed hab Compl); ειπον 960 = \mathfrak{A} Sam (revision towards the MT and SP יתמרס); ελαλησα C⁽⁻⁷⁷⁾-126 44 646; λελαληκα (λελελακηκα 618) A F M O^{r-767}-15-29 cI^{r-126} d^{r-44} s t z 18 46 55 59 76' 424 426 509 Aeth Syh^{mg}

31:13 ὁρᾶτε καὶ τὰ σάββατά] πλην το σαββα 960 (σαββα in 960 appears to be a nonsensical error for σαββατον, unless read as an abbreviation or dialectical form; πλην implies knowledge of the Hebrew reading תס of the MT and SP); om ὁρᾶτε καὶ Arab

31:13 παρ' ἐμοὶ καὶ ἐν ὑμῖν] εμου [και] ανα μεσον υμων 960 (probably an error for ανα μεσον εμου και ανα μεσον υμων, which implies knowledge of the MT and SP בניני ובניכם)³⁵

As a general synthesis concerning the textual character of 960 based on the preserved texts, we can say that 960 is a heavily revised text with loose affiliation with the Byzantine *n* group. Multiple errors seem to have affected the text of 960 *after* these processes of revision. In four minor phrases, 960 agrees in number with the SP against all other witnesses, making the SP the closest Hebrew text to 960, though it is not entirely clear whether these agreements are revisional or accidental.³⁶ 960, therefore, reflects the relatively careless transmission of a heavily revised Greek text. This analysis of the preserved texts accords well with the lack of 23:14-31:11, which probably reflects an approach to the text without any intent to precisely reproduce a written exemplar containing the complete, continuous text of the book of Exodus.

Comparison of Rahlfs 896 and 960

³⁵ Stegmüller, *Berliner Septuagintafragmente*, 13.

³⁶ It is worth noting here that Hempel, "Review," 123, suggested that 960 reflects the Σαμαρειτικόν, possibly from a Samaritan provenance, rather than the Septuagint. Nevertheless, as noted above, the manuscript is almost certainly of Egyptian Christian origin and shows signs of dependence upon the Septuagint, even if it does reflect some Samaritan readings. The agreements with the SP are probably not distinctive enough to support Hempel's contention, and 960 frequently disagrees with the SP in significant readings.

Rahlfs 896 and 960 provide a rare opportunity for comparison and contrast. Not only are they typologically very similar, but they actually overlap in specific passages with which their writers interacted (at least 23:10-16). What is particularly interesting is that, while both adopt the text of Exodus selectively, they do so in different ways and choosing different texts. 896 omits 23:10-13 and 23:15b-16a, but retains 23:14-15a and 23:16b. 960, on the other hand, retains 23:10-13, but omits 23:14-16. In other words, both omit 23:15b-16a, 896 omits 23:10-13 retained in 960, 960 omits 23:14-15a and 23:16b retained in 896, and never do the two retain the same text. This mixed pattern of agreement and disagreement further corroborates the conclusions based on the intrinsic material and textual evidence that these manuscripts cannot reflect earlier stages in the literary development of the book of Exodus, but rather can only be adequately explained by the selective use of the book of Exodus essentially as known in other witnesses.

Both 896 and 960 clearly reproduce Exodus *selectively*. In the case of 896, the selection seems somewhat arbitrary and may not even reflect a particular literary intention, if it was indeed a school exercise. 960 seems to reflect an intentional compilation of passages relating to periods of rest. Perhaps this topical selection should be understood in the context of personal study. The texts of 896 and 960 differ on which texts to retain and which to omit, no doubt based on the different underlying purposes for their creation.

The writers of the texts of both 896 and 960 also *sequentially* select passages from Exodus, retaining the sequence of their base texts in the resulting texts. The same phenomenon can be seen in other excerpted texts, such as 4Q175 and 4QExod^d. This may suggest a tendency to construct such selective texts while reading through the book of Exodus sequentially, rather than sporadic spot-checking, as might be more feasible with modern referencing tools. The person who created the short text of 896 appears to have worked through this passage of Exodus sequentially, omitting large quantities of text as he advanced through the book. The compiler of the text in 960 appears to have read through the book of Exodus and sequentially excerpted passages relating to periods of rest.

Both 896 and 960 also contain passages from Exodus *substantially* and *exclusively*. The writers of these texts retain large portions of text from Exodus, rather than merely occasional small snippets and citations. The selections are apparently not reworked into the running narrative or structure of a different work, nor do the writers alter the text to smooth out transitions between selected passages. Neither do they select passages from other books of the Greek Old Testament in the preserved portions of these manuscripts, although we

cannot exclude the possibility of selections from other books in the now-lost portions.

Conclusion

Rahlfs 896 and 960 illustrate well how literary texts were selectively reused in Greek-speaking Christian circles in Egypt in late antiquity. These two manuscripts serve as important reminders of the variety of media in which the texts of ancient literary works have been preserved and that these texts can only be fully understood in light of the diverse material contexts in which they are preserved.

DREW LONGACRE

University of Helsinki

Helsinki, Finland

drewlongacre@yahoo.com

Appendix: Transcriptions of Rahlfs 896 and 960

Rahlfs 896 = P. Rendel Harris Inv. 54 c (front →)

Column I	Column II
<p style="text-align: right;">... 22⁸² εαν δε</p> <p>μη ευρεθη ο λεψας, προς ελευσεται ο κυριος της οικιας ενωπιον του θεου, και ομειται, η μην μη αυτο]ς πεⁱ πονηρευσθαι εφ' ολης της παρακ]αταⁱⁱ θηκης του πλησιον. ⁹ κατα παν ρητον αδικημα περι τε μοσχου και υποζυγιου και προβατου και...ⁱⁱⁱ</p>	<p>²⁶ σεις αυτω·] ²⁷ εστιν^{iv} [γαρ] τρ[υτο Περιβο]λαιον·^v αυτω^{vi} μον[ον^{vii} το ι]ματιον· αυτω· ασχημο συ]γης· αυτου· εν τινι· κοιμη θη]σεται· εαν ουν· καταβο]ηση π[ρ]ος^{viii} εμε· εισακουσο[μαι αυτου· ελ[εη]μων· γαρ εμι· ^{ix x} ³¹ και κ[ρ]εα· εηρ[ι]αλωτα·^{xi} ουκ εδεσθε^{xii} τω δε κυνι· αποριγεται· αυτα^{xiii} 23 ¹ Ου πα[ρ]αδεξη· ακοην· μ[αταιαν· ον συνκα[τ]αθηση· μετ[α του αδι κου· γενεσθε·^{xiv} μαρτυς·^{xv} α[δικος· ² ουκ εση· μετα πολλων·^{xvi} [επι κακια· ^{xvii} ¹⁴ Τρεις· καιρους· του εν[ιαυτου εορ τασετε μοι· ¹⁵ την εορτη]ν των α ζυμων· φυλαξασθε [ποιειν· επτα ημε ρας· εδεσθε· αζυ[μα, καθαπερ ενε τειλαμην σο]ι, ^{xviii} κ]ατα καιρο[ν του μηνος των γεων· εν γα[ρ αυτω εξηλθες εξ Αι γυπτου· ^{xix xx} [¹⁶ και εορτην συντε λειας· επ εξο[δου του ενιαυτου εν τη συναγωγη^{xxi} [των εργων σου των εκ] του· αγρο[ν σου· ¹⁷ τρεις καιρους</p>

ⁱ Manfredi transcribes this line as “[...]”. Paleographically, the traces on this line are most easily read as σγα, but there are no possible identifications for this string of letters in the immediate context. Other possibilities are σπε (22:8) or σπο (21:24), both of which could allow for the reading ατα in the following line. There do not seem to be any viable identifications in the context immediately preceding the passages preserved on column II, so it is very unlikely that column I simply preserved the uninterrupted text of chapter 22. I have transcribed the closest possible identification to the beginning of column II, though it remains uncertain. If this was indeed a school exercise or other type of anthology, the text may not even be from the book of Exodus. There is a 1.9 cm intercolumnar margin between the ends of both of these lines and the left margin of column II. 2.3-2.4 cm of uninscribed papyrus from the intercolumnar margin is preserved elsewhere above and below these lines, so they clearly jutted out far to the right of a jagged right margin, if indeed it was a full column. The notional right margin of column I does not appear to be preserved.

ⁱⁱ Manfredi transcribes this line as “[].α”.

ⁱⁱⁱ There may be a tiny trace at the edge of the fragment at this point, but it is impossible to identify.

^{iv} There is a small trace of ν not mentioned by Manfredi.

^v There is a small trace of λ on the single strand to the left of α not mentioned by Manfredi, and possibly another on the section of papyrus connected by a single strand just above it (the strand should be repositioned to be vertical). The loose strand above and to the left of these strands I cannot identify, but there is an ink trace.

^{vi} These traces could alternatively be read $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$ with Manfredi, who does not note the final traces. These traces somewhat favor ω , and the fact that the scribe adds $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omega$ in the next line may further support this argument.

^{vii} There small traces of $\mu\omicron$ not mentioned by Manfredi.

^{viii} There is a small ink trace at this point visible from the back side due to a twisted papyrus strand, but I cannot place it in its proper location on the front.

^{ix} The entirety of this interval is preserved on the papyrus.

^x Exodus 22:28-31a is lacking in 896.

^{xi} Manfredi suggests this is incorrectly written for $\theta\eta\rho[\]\alpha\lambda\omega\tau\alpha$. I have confirmed the reading on the fragment. The surface is preserved without ink between both upper and lower arcs and the central horizontal, so it cannot be a θ .

^{xii} This middle dot/dash is slightly longer than most of the high dots in this manuscript (2 mm vs. an average of 1 mm), but is very similar to the dot after $\epsilon\mu\iota$ on the previous line. I suspect there was no intended difference between these various dots. There is also an additional 5 mm of blank preserved papyrus following, such that we clearly have the right margin at this point.

^{xiii} This word is followed by 4 mm of blank preserved papyrus, such that we clearly have the right margin here. Note that the right margin is jagged, as is the right margin of the preceding column.

^{xiv} Manfredi suggests this is incorrectly written for $\gamma\epsilon\nu\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$. Indeed, the traces cannot fit $\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$. The final traces have blank space between both the upper and lower arcs and the central horizontal, so it was clearly an ϵ .

^{xv} Manfredi notes that ρ is written over an incorrect υ . The error was probably prompted by the high frequency of the diphthong $\alpha\upsilon$ in the preceding lines.

^{xvi} The dot after this word is somewhat longer than average, but less than the dash after $\epsilon\delta\epsilon\sigma\theta\epsilon$ on line 8.

^{xvii} Exodus 23:2b-13 is lacking in 896.

^{xviii} This interval is not preserved on the papyrus, but is likely. Wevers does not cite any longer texts at this point. So also Ralhfs and Fraenkel, *Verzeichnis*, 44.

^{xix} Part of this interval is preserved on the papyrus. There is a dark spot immediately after $\gamma\upsilon\pi\tau\omicron\upsilon$ in line with the letters, which could perhaps be similar to the dots after $\epsilon\mu\iota$ on line 7 and $\epsilon\delta\epsilon\sigma\theta\epsilon$ on line 8. It is perhaps interesting that this is also a point where a long passage is lacking. Nevertheless, the facts that a clear dot is visible above $\gamma\upsilon\pi\tau\omicron\upsilon$ and the dark spot here is fainter and may not even be ink argues against its significance.

^{xx} Exodus 23:15b-16a is lacking in 896.

^{xxi} There are dark spots that may be traces of the last two letters at this point.

Rahlfs 960 = P. Berlin 13994

Front	Back
<p>23 ¹⁰ λυτοιητε εν γη Αιγυπτω. σο]ν· και συ[ν]αξ[εις τα γενηματα αυτη[ς· ¹¹ τω δε εβδομω αφα[ισιν ποιησις· και ανεσ[εις αυ την· και εδοντ[αι οι πτω χοι του λαου [σου· τα δε ὑπολιπομεν[α εδονⁱ ται τα θηρια τρο[υⁱⁱ αγρου, ουτως ποιησις· τ[οις αμ πελουσιν σου και [τοις ελαιουσιν σου· ¹² ῥημ[ε ραις ποιησις το εργο[ν σου· ⁱⁱⁱ τη δε ημερα τη ε[βδομη σαββατισ[εις, ...? ινα αναπαυσηται ο βους σου και το υποζυγιον σου, και ινα αναψυξη ο υιος της</p>	<p>παιδισκης] σου και ο π[ρος ηλ]ντρος· ¹³ και παντα οσ]α ειπον προς υμας φ]υλαξεται· ^{iv} και ονο μα θ]εων^v αλλοτριων ουκ α]γαμνησις^{vi} ουδε μη ακουσ]θησονται· ^{vii} εκ του στ]ροματος σου ^{viii} 31 ¹² Και ελα]λησεν κς̄ μετα^{ix} Μου]ση λεγων ¹³ Και συ λαλησον τοις ὑιοις^x ι]ηλ λεγων πλην το^{xi} σαββα^{xii} μου φυλαξατ(αι)^{xiii} ε]στιν γαρ σημιον εμου και] ανα μεσον υμων εις τας γενεας υμων, ινα γνωτε οτι εγω κυριος ο αγιαζων υμας. ¹⁴ και</p>

ⁱ Stegmüller says spacing suggests either υπολιπομεν[α εδον]ται or more probably υπολιπομεν[α αυτων εδε]ται. There does not seem to be room for αυτων, but the longer reconstruction of the verb is somewhat more likely.

ⁱⁱ There are rounded traces of the left edge of ο that cannot fit α. Stegmüller correctly suggests this reconstruction without noting the traces.

ⁱⁱⁱ There are three dots around the ν that may be ink, but none of them can be interpreted as a high dot. One most probably is intended as a low dot to mark punctuation, while the other two are probably not intentional.

^{iv} Stegmüller suggests that φ]υλαξεται is written instead of the imperative φ]υλαξατε, suggesting that the OG had the middle voice. Only 458 actually reads the expected φυλαζεται. More probably, φ]υλαξεται is simply a phonetic misspelling of φ]υλαξατε.

^v The full spelling of θ]εων here is not entirely unexpected in reference to pagan deities. For a parallel situation, see 1 Cor 8:5-6 in P46, as pointed out in a recent paper by Benjamin Overcash.

^{vi} Stegmüller prefers the active form here as more appropriate for the OG, but this is unlikely.

^{vii} Stegmüller notes that this colon appears to be misplaced and probably was supposed to be at the end of the following line. See the main body of this article for further discussion.

^{viii} Stegmüller notes that the singular reading σου is related to the prior reading αν]αμνησις.

^{ix} Stegmüller suggests that μετα is intending to faithfully translate the Hebrew preposition מֵא, as in 31:18, but this is unlikely.

^x Stegmüller transcribes ὅτοις. Cavallo and Maehler, *Greek Bookhands*, 136 transcribe ὅτοις. There appear to be two faint dots above the υ, but it is not entirely clear what is ink and what is deterioration on the surface. Furthermore, the dots are not centered as are the other rough breathing marks on this page. If ink between the two dots has deteriorated, they match the squiggly mark of ὑπολιπομεν[α on the previous page well.

^{xi} Stegmüller suggests the abbreviation το(v) here, though this is not visibly indicated.

^{xii} Stegmüller considers the form σαββα to be a scribal error, though noting a Pontic form σαββα, -ατος. There are a number of examples in the Exodus tradition of scribal errors where σαββα is written first without the rest of the word; cf. 16:25 (Ra 458, 72, 426); 20:10 (Ra 107); 31:15 (Ra 381).

^{xiii} There is a well-known vertical squiggly symbol indicating this abbreviation after the τ. Cf. C. Faulmann, *Das Buch der Schrift* (2nd ed.; Vienna: Druck und Verlag der kaiserlich-königlichen Hof- und Staatsdruckeri, 1880), 175. This disambiguation indicates the same spelling as in 23:13, which appears to be simply an incorrect form for the imperative. Stegmüller notes that λεγων πλην το σαββα μου φυλαξατ(αι) agrees mostly with the MT, though “Sabbaths” is plural in the Hebrew. Stegmüller thinks the singular may in fact be correct.

In the Court of Foreigners: Translational Strategies in the Septuagint of Exodus 7-9 and Daniel 1-6

LUKE GORTON

Translation is a complicated business. Careful choice must be made of words and syntax, and often the choices that are made betray the intentions and biases of the translator. The stakes are raised further when the translation occurs between languages and cultures which share a wide gap in time, space, or structure. Beyond the linguistic issues, the translators of the Septuagint often wrestled with how to translate certain terms and concepts which may have been controversial to the communities for which these translations were intended.¹ One of these issues was that of the quasi-religious, quasi-magician practitioners who appear at the courts of Pharaoh and the Babylonian king. In this article, I will examine the translational strategies used by the Septuagint translators to refer to these practitioners and the Jews who came into contact with them, and I will furthermore discuss what we may infer from these strategies about the biases of the translators.

The Hebrew Bible regularly takes a negative view of those who practice religious-magical activities outside of the purview of Yahweh and his priesthood. Activities such as those represented by the Hebrew root *qsm* are either proscribed (Deuteronomy 18:10), or else are shown to be practiced by foreigners (e.g., Balaam in Numbers 22-24) or by wicked Israelites (as in 2 Kings 17:17). In all three of these cases as well as in every other instance of the occurrence of the *qsm* root in the Hebrew Bible except one, the Septuagint translators render this root by a form of the Greek root *μάντ*—that is to say, *μάντις*, *μαντεία*, or *μαντεύομαι*, depending on the context. The context of these passages allows us to surmise that this family of Greek words had taken on a negative connotation in the Hellenistic Jewish community for whom these texts were intended. This suspicion is strengthened when we look at the one

¹ For an excellent discussion of Jewish attitudes toward “magic” in the Hellenistic period and thereafter, see Gideon Bohak, *Ancient Jewish Magic* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008).

instance in Isaiah 3:1-4 in which the Hebrew root *qsm* is translated by a different Greek term, στοχαστής:²

Behold, the Master, the Lord Sabaoth, will take away from Judah and from Jerusalem strong man and strong woman, strength of bread and strength of water, giant and strong man and warlike man and judge and prophet and στοχαστής and elder and captain of fifty and wondrous counselor and wise builder and learned listener; and I will set over them young men as their rulers, and mockers will rule them.³

The translation of the Hebrew term *qsm* as στοχαστής here (in contradistinction to this root's translation everywhere else in the Septuagint, including elsewhere in the book of Isaiah) provides a window into the attitude of the translator toward this particular supernatural practice.⁴ One thing that should stand out to the reader in this passage is that *qsm* here could be interpreted as a positive thing: it forms part of a list of the types of people Yahweh will take away from Judah and Jerusalem as punishment. Clearly, this implies not only that there are individuals practicing *qsm* in Judah, but that their presence may in fact be desirable (at least to the prophet's audience, although perhaps not to the prophet himself). The possibility of this interpretation was apparently not acceptable to the Septuagint translator, and so he effaced it by translating this instance of *qsm* with a more neutral and less marked Greek term.⁵ So how ought we translate στοχαστής? If the family of Greek terms to which it belongs is any indication, it must have sounded something like "investigator" or "one

² Takamitsu Muraoka, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint* (Louvain: Peeters, 2009), 638, translates στοχαστής as 'diviner', solely on the context of Isaiah 3:2. Moisés Silva's translation of Isaiah in *A New English Translation of the Septuagint* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 827, does likewise, while the *Septuaginta Deutsch* edited by Martin Karrer and Wolfgang Kraus (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2009), 1233, translates 'Wahrsager'. J. Lust, E. Eynikel, and K. Hauspie, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1996), suggest 'conjecturer, diviner'. Στοχαστής is a hapax in the Septuagint. It also occurs four times in Philo and Josephus, there taking the general sense of 'conjecturer' and not appearing to have any kind of consistent polarity.

³ All translations of Septuagint passages are the author's own, with reference to scholarly translations such as NETS.

⁴ Interestingly, a few manuscripts do attest μάντιν here, although these variants appear to be revisions of an original στοχαστήν.

⁵ As Moisés Silva says in the NETS introduction to Isaiah (824), "[the Septuagint translator] is sensitive to the thrust of the book as a whole and seeks to come up with teachings that are up-building".

who seeks out [knowledge]” to a Greek speaker.⁶ This was surely a religiously harmless individual.

This brief discussion of the translation of the root *qsm* in the Septuagint gives us some perspective as we now turn to examine the way the Septuagint translators handled the supernatural practices taking place in the courts of the rulers of Egypt and Babylon. From an examination of the root *qsm* alone, we can see that the translators of the Septuagint were not above “cleaning up” what the original Hebrew said by making a clearer distinction between the pious practices of God’s chosen people and the scandalous practices of those outside the community. With such a translational philosophy in mind, let us turn first to examine the treatment in the Septuagint of the priest-magicians of Pharaoh in Exodus 7-9 (along with their less dramatic appearance in Genesis 41).

The appearance of Pharaoh’s agents in Exodus 7-9 comes at a famous and entertaining juncture in the story of the Exodus: caught in a contest of supernatural powers with Moses, Aaron, and ultimately Yahweh himself, the Egyptian priests have no difficulty in replicating the first three miracles performed by the two brothers at Yahweh’s request (namely, turning their staff into a snake followed by the plagues of blood and frogs). However, beginning with the third plague (that of gnats), the Egyptian priests find themselves no longer able to replicate the supernatural acts of Moses and Aaron, and they are consigned to disgrace for the rest of the story. These figures are referenced seven times in these three chapters (7:11, 7:22, 8:3, 8:14, 8:15, and twice in 9:11) by the Hebrew term *hṛṭm*. Furthermore, if we turn back to Genesis 41, we find that this same Hebrew term is used twice (41:8, 41:24) to refer to the priests of a different Pharaoh who were unable to interpret their master’s dream. (The Hebrew term *hṛṭm* occurs only twice more in the Hebrew Bible, both in the book of Daniel; we will discuss these final two occurrences below.)

One might expect to find a uniform translation in the Septuagint for such a rare and specific Hebrew term. However, when we examine the nine instances of *hṛṭm* which refer to the Egyptian priests, we surprisingly find that the Septuagint translators make use of not one or two but three different Greek translations. One rendering, ἐξηγητής, is restricted to the two instances of the

⁶ Muraoka, *Lexicon*, 638, renders στοχάζομαι as ‘to investigate and determine the extent or size or nature of’, while Lust et al, *Lexicon*, 441, suggests ‘to reckon, calculate, guess at, have regard for’. Meanwhile, Henry Liddell, Robert Scott, Henry Jones, and Roderick McKenzie, *A Greek-English Lexicon* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), 1650, offer a host of cognates, including στοχαστικός ‘able to guess, sagacious’, and renders στοχαστής itself as ‘diviner, one who aims at [something, presumably knowledge]’. The verb is fairly common in Philo and Josephus with this general meaning.

term in Gen 41:8. This particular translation seems to be entirely dependent on the context:

And it became morning, and [Pharaoh's] heart was troubled. And he called and sent for all of the ἐξηγηταί of Egypt and all of its wise men, and Pharaoh related to them the dream, and there was no one who could explain it to Pharaoh.

The translation of *hrtm* here seems to be motivated by a simple desire to explain the function of this particular kind of servant of Pharaoh. The Greek term ἐξηγητής is regularly translated to mean something fairly innocuous such as ‘interpreter’ (Muraoka) or ‘expounder’ (NETS).⁷ In any case, it does not seem that this rendering is meant to convey any sense of approbation, perhaps because the individuals in question are not actively opposing the protagonist of the story (or perhaps because they are not engaged in an activity the translator finds objectionable). On the other hand, in Exodus 7-9, we see that these same *hrtm* do indeed oppose the protagonists of the story (as well as God himself). As a consequence, in this account they receive two quite different labels, ἐπαιιδός and φάρμακος, both of which have a more negative connotation than ἐξηγητής.⁸ Yet these two renderings are not scattered randomly throughout the three chapters. Rather, the rendering ἐπαιιδός occurs five times in a row (7:11, 7:22, 8:3, 8:14, 8:15), while the rendering φάρμακος is restricted to the two instances of the term in 9:11. What, if anything, might

⁷ Muraoka, *Lexicon*, 251, and Robert J. V. Hiebert, Genesis, *NETS*, 34. Marguerite Harl, *La Bible d’Alexandrie: La Genèse* (Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1994), 133, translates ‘interprètes’, while Karrer and Kraus, *Septuaginta Deutsch*, 44, have ‘Ausleger’. Liddell and Scott, *Lexicon*, 593 give ‘expounder, interpreter’, which mirrors the rendering in Lust et al, *Lexicon*, 160. Harl, *La Genèse*, 273, points out that “(l)e grec emploie le mot *exēgētēs*, <interprète>, bien attesté depuis Hérodote et Platon pour nommer le prêtre chargé d’expliquer les rites”. In both Philo and Josephus, the term is almost completely harmless: it refers to “exegetes” of the Jewish Law.

⁸ ἐπαιιδός is translated ‘enchanter, charmer’ by Muraoka, *Lexicon*, 260 as well as Lust et al, *Lexicon*, 164, and Larry J. Perkins, Exodus, *NETS*, consistently renders ‘enchanter’. Alain Le Boulluec and Pierre Sandevor, *La Bible d’Alexandrie: L’Exode* (Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1989), likewise translates ‘enchanteurs’ but Karrer and Kraus, *Septuaginta Deutsch*, have the more descriptive (and editorial) ‘Scharlatane’. Liddell and Scott, *Lexicon*, 610, imply the definition ‘charmer’. With respect to φάρμακος, Muraoka, *Lexicon*, 711 renders ‘sorcerer’, although *NETS* shows sensitivity to the original Hebrew and renders ‘sorcerer’ in 7:11 but ‘magician’ in 9:11. On the other hand, *BdA* consistently chooses ‘sorcières’, and *Septuaginta Deutsch* translates ‘Magier’. Liddell and Scott give the harsh ‘poisoner, sorcerer, magician’, while Lust et al, *A Greek-English Lexicon*, 500, similarly translate “mixer of magical potions, sorcerer, magician”.

explain the distribution of these two differing translations for the same Hebrew term?⁹

Perhaps the most likely explanation involves the attitude of the Septuagint translator toward the Egyptian priests in each of these moments. As mentioned, at the beginning of the contest, the Egyptian priests actually have some success in replicating the miracles performed by Moses and Aaron, as in Exodus 7:20-22:

And Moses and Aaron did so, just as the Lord commanded them: and raising up with his staff Aaron struck the water in the river in the presence of Pharaoh and his attendants and he changed all of the water in the river to blood. And the fish in the river died, and the river stank, and the Egyptians were unable to drink water from the river, and the blood was in the whole land of Egypt. But the *ἐπαοιδοί* of the Egyptians did the same thing by their sorceries; and the heart of Pharaoh was hardened, and he did not listen to them, just as the Lord said.

While the Egyptian priests are successfully performing miracles throughout much of chapters 7 and 8, the Septuagint translator renders them by the term *ἐπαοιδός*. This rendering continues until the moment when they effectively lose the contest by failing to replicate the plague of gnats. The next time we meet these characters, they are in a much sorrier state (Ex 9:10-11):

And [Moses] took the ash of the furnace in Pharaoh's presence, and he spread it toward heaven, and there arose sores, oozing boils, on men and on livestock. And the *φάρμακοι* were not able to stand before Moses because of the sores, for the sores were on the *φάρμακοι* and in all of Egypt.

Although a reader of this story in the original Hebrew would notice no difference in terminology relating to the priests from chapters 8 to 9, the Septuagint translator chooses to use a different term to render the Hebrew term *hrtm* in

⁹ Perkins notes in his introduction to Exodus in *NETS* (43-45) that “in some contexts where the same Hebrew term is used repeatedly, the translator selected different Greek terms as glosses for the same Hebrew”. This phenomenon, then, is not unique within the book of Exodus. Perkins also notes that “in Exodus the translator was sensitive to the Hebrew context and so did not hesitate to choose different Greek terms so that the Hebrew sense, as he understood it, would be conveyed adequately. Once he connected a Greek term semantically with a Hebrew term, he tended to continue with this equivalency, *unless the context led him to gloss the source text in a different way*” (emphasis mine). The reasons for his decision in the case of *hrtm* are under discussion here.

this verse. It seems likely that the difference lies in the context: while the Egyptian priests were engaged in successfully replicating supernatural acts, they were called *ἐπαιδοί*, but after their power failed them they were labeled *φάρμακοι*.

Might this reflect a wider distinction throughout the Septuagint between these two related but different terms for practitioners of supernatural acts? It seems that it does, at least in some way. The occurrence of *ἐπαιδός* and its cognates *ἐπαιδῆ* and *ἐπαίδω* is sporadic throughout the Septuagint; the latter two terms are used to translate all four instances of the Hebrew root *hbr*,¹⁰ and *ἐπαιδός* is also used to translate the Hebrew term *yd'ny* in four of its eleven occurrences.¹¹ The term *yd'ny* is also translated by fairly unremarkable and rather neutral terms such as *γνώστης*¹² and *τερατοσκόπος* in other instances.¹³ Put in this company, we might surmise that *ἐπαιδός* was a term of rather generic reproach within the Hellenistic Jewish community.¹⁴ On the other hand, the Greek family of terms represented by the *φάρμακ*- root (that is to say, *φάρμακος*, *φάρμακον*, *φαρμακεία*, and *φαρμακεύομαι*) is the unanimous translation for the Hebrew root *kšp* during its 13 occurrences in the Hebrew Bible.¹⁵ The Hebrew root *kšp* is a consistently and heavily proscribed family of terms, and its rendering by the Greek *φάρμακ*- root every time it occurs should indicate that the Septuagint translators had an understanding of this latter root's negative valence.¹⁶ Thus, while both the *ἐπαιδός* and the

¹⁰ See Deuteronomy 18:11 (x2); Isaiah 47:9, 47:12.

¹¹ See Leviticus 19:31, 20:6, 20:27; 2 Chronicles 33:6.

¹² Muraoka, *A Greek-English Lexicon's* definition (135) is rather non-judgmental: "one who is possessed of esoteric knowledge". NETS (339) has the almost colloquial translation "those in the know".

¹³ For the other seven instances, see Deuteronomy 18:10; 1 Samuel 28:3, 28:9; 2 Kings 21:6, 23:24; Isaiah 8:19, 19:3.

¹⁴ This should in no way be taken to imply that the term *ἐπαιδός* has anything approaching positive valence in the Septuagint, or to imply that *yd'ny* is not heavily proscribed in the Hebrew Bible. In fact, the four instances in which the former term translates the latter (including the three in Leviticus) represent the harshest uses of each term, including a death sentence in 20:27. Nonetheless, based off of the Exodus usage, I contend that the term is less harsh when placed in relation to *φάρμακος*.

¹⁵ See Exodus 7:11, 22:18; Deuteronomy 18:10; 2 Kings 9:22; 2 Chronicles 33:6; Isaiah 47:9, 47:12; Jeremiah 27:9; Daniel 2:2; Micah 5:11; Nahum 3:4 (x2); Malachi 3:5.

¹⁶ The term *φάρμακον* ('remedy' or 'medicine') is often not proscribed at all, as in Sirach 6:16 and 38:4, where it does not translate the Hebrew root *kšp*. However, a look at Philo and Josephus shows that the terms from this Greek family of roots which refer to a *practitioner* are consistently and strongly proscribed. Philo (who uses the term *φαρμακευτής* in place of *φάρμακος*) approves of an immediate death penalty for such a person, while Josephus writes that calling someone a *φάρμακος* was a "bitter insult" (*Antiquities* 9.118).

φάρμακος are proscribed in the Septuagint, the former seems to be somewhat lower on the scale of disapproval than the latter.¹⁷

If this is the case, then why would the Septuagint translator go to such lengths to make this distinction? Perhaps the answer lies in the simple fact that the Egyptian priests clearly had some degree of power during the first part of the story. In the polytheistic or henotheistic world of the early Israelites, such a demonstration of power would have been no surprise: clearly some god (or force) other than Yahweh was lending them his power. However, in the monotheistic world of Hellenistic Judaism, this success (however temporary) on the part of the Egyptian priests would have to be explained more carefully. Could it have been the case that Yahweh was actually permitting the priests to succeed for a while? Given the context of the story in which Yahweh is said to “harden Pharaoh’s heart”, this is not an unreasonable interpretation. If it is in fact the case that the priests are the agents of Yahweh for a while, then these priests are perhaps thought to deserve a term somewhat less harsh than φάρμακος, at least as long as they are succeeding. But what about the fact that they are using methods which the Septuagint translator clearly does not approve of to achieve their success which is in fact granted by Yahweh? When we examine the terms used for the *methods* and not the *priests*, we find that all four times (7:11, 7:22, 8:3, 8:14) the term φαρμακεία is used to render the Hebrew root *lṭ*. By calling the priests ἐπαιδοί yet labeling their methods φαρμακεία, the Septuagint translator may in fact be adding his own interpretation to the story: while the priests themselves had some degree of (temporary) quasi-legitimacy due to the fact that the one true God was working through them, the methods by which they believed they achieved their results were still quite fake.

To further complicate matters (but also to bolster our case for translational artistry), the Egyptian priests are originally introduced in 7:11 by two other Hebrew terms before they begin to be referred to as *hṛṭm* later in 7:11 and thenceforth in the story. These terms are *hkm* and *kšp*, and the latter (as just discussed) is translated dutifully by the negative term φάρμακος as it always is

¹⁷ This same relationship between the two terms is present as far back as the dawn of Greek literature: in Homer, the former root is used only positively, while the latter has mixed connotations; see Fritz Graf, *Magic in the Ancient World* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1997), 28. The family of terms is rare in Philo and Josephus, but it is potentially positive (as when Solomon is said to have prescribed ἐπωδάς which could be used for benign purposes).

in the Septuagint.¹⁸ The former term is usually translated in the Septuagint by σοφός or the like, but here it is rendered by the more colorful Greek term σοφιστής.¹⁹ This term is ambivalent in Greek and, depending on the intended meaning, can be rather positive or quite negative.²⁰ Given the fact that it is paired here with φάρμακος, we might surmise that the translator of Exodus meant σοφιστής in its negative sense of one who purports to have supernatural powers but is in fact a charlatan or at least a quack.²¹ Given that the Egyptian priests are provided with such a negative introduction, the switch to ἐπαυδοί within the same verse (and continuing on for two chapters) is particularly noteworthy inasmuch as it appears to set these individuals off as being at least a bit more respectable while they are actually accomplishing real acts of power in chapters 7 and 8. In effect, the translator begins by delivering a negative impression of these characters as φάρμακοι and σοφισταί, but goes on to temper that impression somewhat until chapter 9 when he once and for all reveals them to be φάρμακοι, just as they were labeled at the beginning of the story. Thus there is a three-act play of sorts in the translation: the translator introduces a cast of characters consisting of “sorcerers” and “charlatans”, he plays with the idea that perhaps they really have legitimate power as “enchanters”, and then finally reassures the reader that they are just “sorcerers” after all. It is clear that the translational choices of the Septuagint translator do

¹⁸ John William Wevers, *Notes on the Greek Text of Exodus* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990) points out that a number of ancient translators failed to distinguish between the two Hebrew roots *kšp* and *hṛṭm* when translating this verse, so it is noteworthy that the Septuagint translator does distinguish between them here.

¹⁹ Boulluec and Sandevor, *BdA*, 723, note that “le terme grec *sophistēs* (hapax dans le Pentateuque), associé au nom des sorciers avec une valeur pejorative, est substitué ici à *sophós*, <sage>, équivalent habituel de *hākām*, <sage, habile, savant>, utilisé même lorsqu’il s’agit des devins consultés par Pharaon en Gen 41, 8.”

²⁰ Muraoka, *Lexicon*, 629, renders this term “sage (of non-Israelite background)”. Meanwhile, Liddell and Scott, *Lexicon*, 1622, notes that the term can be used quite positively (as ‘master of one’s craft, expert’) or quite negatively (as ‘quibbler’ or ‘cheat’). Lust et al, *Lexicon*, 433, also reflects this ambiguity: “wise man, diviner, sophist (in pejor. sense).” In Philo, the term is intended to be negative: σοφίαν μὲν γὰρ Ἰσαάκ, σοφιστείαν δὲ Ἰσμαὴλ κεκλήρωται (*On Sobriety* 9). Meanwhile, the term appears to be used as a milder pejorative in Josephus.

²¹ Gerhard Kittel and Gerhard Friedrich, *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* (Eerdmans: Grand Rapids, 1964-1975) VII 497, discuss this briefly: “For the transl. σοφία is obviously too strongly theological a term. This is why the wise men of Egypt in Ex. 7:11 and those of Babylon in Da. (5 times) are not σοφοί but σοφισταί – a word with a very negative ring from the time of Socrates’ criticism of the Sophists.” This analysis is echoed in the Exodus volume of *BdA* (36-37).

much to shape the narrative and also to reshape it from the original language, since in Hebrew there is no return to calling the Egyptian priests *kšp* in ch. 9.²²

We now shift our focus from the court of Pharaoh to the court of Nebuchadnezzar as described in Daniel 1-2. Much like the narrative just discussed, this story contains an account of foreign priests/magicians who attempt to perform supernatural deeds on behalf of their king. As in the Joseph story of Genesis 41, these individuals fail but are surpassed and even supplanted by a pious Israelite. As we examine the translation of terms related to these supernatural activities in Daniel, we will find that the translator likewise mixes his own theological commentary in with the translation. Yet our analysis of translational bias in Daniel will be aided by the fact that we have not one but two extant translations of Daniel in the Septuagint, namely the Old Greek and that of Theodotion.²³ We will examine each of these in turn, but will spend the majority of our time on the Old Greek translation.

Before arriving at the Old Greek translation, let us discuss the philosophy of the so-called Theodotionic text with regards to the terminology we have been discussing. There are two verses of interest in the Hebrew portions of Daniel, namely 1:20 and 2:2. These read as follows in the translation of Theodotion:

And in every matter of wisdom and understanding which the king sought from them, he found them ten times better than all the ἐπαιδοί and μάγοι who were in his kingdom. (1:20)

And the king spoke to call the ἐπαιδοί and μάγοι and φάρμακοι and Chaldeans to tell the king his dreams, and they came and stood before the king. (2:2)

²² It has been suggested by a reviewer that the translator may in fact simply be following a different Vorlage here, given that φάρμακος is the consistent translation of the *kšp* root throughout the Septuagint. While this possibility ought to be considered, there appears to be no *a priori* reason to believe that this is the case in Exodus 9:11. As Tim McLay, *The OG and Th Versions of Daniel* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996), 9 notes in his discussion of this general issue, “Only with a balanced assessment of the [translation technique] of the whole book/unit in question can the text-critic begin to evaluate each possible variant and whether it originates from a differing *Vorlage*.” Given what Perkins, *NETS* noted about the translation technique of Exodus, it is wholly consistent with the translator’s idiosyncrasies to render the same Hebrew term with multiple Greek lexemes.

²³ See the discussion in R. Timothy McLay, Daniel, *NETS*, 991.

The Theodotonic translation of Daniel is noteworthy for its close rendering of the Hebrew as found in the Masoretic Text.²⁴ This close rendering includes its approach to translating lexemes: the translator strove to render a given Hebrew term with the same Greek word throughout the book. The above two verses are a case in point. In Daniel 1:20, the two Hebrew terms which underlie ἐπαιδούς and μάγους are the now-familiar root *hrtm* and another root, *ʾšp*. In 2:2, these two roots occur again and are again translated by ἐπαιδούς and μάγους; not surprisingly, the following word in the list (φαρμάκους) translates *kšp*. Thus, we see that the translator is consistent in his equivalencies: for *ʾšp* he chose the interesting term μάγος (for which see more below); for *kšp* he chose φάρμακος (a translational choice which, as we have noted, is unanimous in the Septuagint); and for *hrtm* he chose ἐπαιδός (which, to recall the translational details from Exodus 7-9, was the less-negative-but-not-quite-positive option for the term in the Exodus story).²⁵ With such translational consistency, there is little to be said about theological translation in the version of Theodotion.

When we turn to the Old Greek version, we find that the reliable consistency of Theodotion is nowhere to be found. The Old Greek translator felt free to use different Greek terms to translate the same Hebrew term in different circumstances, much like we saw in the translation of Exodus.²⁶ As we examine the same two verses we discussed above, we will notice some significant changes:

And in every rationale and understanding and learning, whatever the king sought from them, he found them ten times wiser than all the σοφισταί and the φιλόλογοι in the whole kingdom. And the king glorified them and set them up as rulers and appointed them over matters in his whole kingdom. (1:20, OG)

²⁴ To quote McLay, Daniel, *NETS*, 993: “The TH version of Daniel is very similar to the Semitic text in the MT.”

²⁵ In Daniel, *NETS*, 995 renders ἐπαιδός as ‘enchanter’, μάγος as ‘magician’, and φάρμακος as ‘sorcerer’, thus showing consistency with its Exodus translation. On the other hand, Karrer and Kraus, *Septuaginta Deutsch*, 1425-6, translates (respectively) ‘Beschwörer’, ‘Magier’ and ‘Zauberer’, thus breaking with the norms established in its translation of Exodus. The editors include an extensive note discussing the varying Greek and German translations of these terms in the commentary in Volume II (3019-20).

²⁶ Dean Orrin Wenthe, *The Old Greek Translation of Daniel 1-6* (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Notre Dame, 1991), 47, notes that the Vorlage used by the Old Greek translator was very similar to the Masoretic Text and stipulates that “[t]he chief differences are in phrases which can be understood as a flexible but faithful rendering by the OG of a text very close to the MT.” McLay, *OG and Th Versions of Daniel* adds (211) that “[t]he most consistent characteristic of OG’s dynamic approach was variety in the choice of lexical equivalents.” This is precisely what we see on display in the OG of 1:20.

And the king commanded that the ἐπαυδοί and the μάγοι and φάρμακοι of the Chaldeans be brought in to announce to the king his dreams, and having come near they stood in the presence of the king. (2:2, OG)

The difference between the Old Greek and Theodotion of 2:2 is minimal, and we see that the translation of the three Hebrew roots *ḥrṭm*, *ʾšp*, and *kšp* is identical in the two translations. However, 1:20 provides some significant differences. Besides the general content of the verse (which we will not discuss here), the translations of the terms *ḥrṭm* and *ʾšp* are remarkably different. Rather than being rendered by the terms ἐπαυδοί and μάγοι as we have seen elsewhere, instead we find the unexpected (and unique) renderings σοφιστής and φιλόλογος.²⁷ While the Old Greek translator is clearly not the literalist that Theodotion was, this quite unexpected translation cannot simply be chalked up to carelessness or some other foible. After all, these two verses—Daniel 1:20 and 2:2—occur only three verses apart from each other. In other words, assuming the Old Greek translator was working sequentially through the book, he would have translated 2:2 almost immediately after he translated 1:20. When he found the same two unusual Hebrew roots in quick succession, it seems unlikely that he would have accidentally translated them differently. Rather, there is reason to believe that these differing renderings were intentional. If that is the case, what might have inspired him to do so?

Much like in the case of the Exodus story, we ought to consider the translations in terms of theological interest and ask what benefit the Old Greek translator might have derived from rendering these identical Hebrew terms in very different ways. The rendering in 2:2 is hardly unusual, so we should focus on 1:20: why translate *ḥrṭm* as σοφιστής and *ʾšp* as φιλόλογος? The answer must be in the context: this verse is describing the comparanda for four good Jewish boys. In the community which produced the Old Greek version of Daniel, would it have been socially acceptable for pious Jews to try to be better ἐπαυδοί and μάγοι than the ἐπαυδοί and μάγοι themselves? To be placed on the same scale as such practitioners implies that one is gifted with the same powers as they are, and this may have been an objectionable thought to the translator. And while ἐπαυδός is a term with somewhat negative connotations (as discussed), the term μάγος is an extremely loaded term in all stages of

²⁷ *NETS*, 995, translates this pair as ‘savants and scholars’, while Karrer and Kraus, *Septuaginta Deutsch*, 1426, opts for the literal ‘Sophisten und Philologen’ (with a footnote noting ‘Philosophen’ as a variant reading).

ancient Greek.²⁸ Borrowed into Greek from Persian (where it had been a term for a Persian priest) at the dawn of the Classical period, this word immediately acquired negative connotations of the “other”, as well as of dangerous or suspect powers. The word represents a perfect (and culturally accurate) translation in a Western culture (whether Greek, Roman, or Jewish) as it conceives of an “Eastern” priest, but the translator may well have felt uncomfortable with the idea that a group of pious Jewish young men might themselves in any way be μάγοι.²⁹ Thus, he chose to render *hṛtm* and *’šp* in an unusual fashion, namely with two terms which have little religious connotation, even if they are interesting in their own right.

The Greek terms which *were* chosen by the Old Greek translator are just as interesting as those that were not. While the readings σοφιστῶν and φιλόλογων are preferred by the editors of the Göttingen edition, the pair σοφιστάς and φιλοσόφους are also attested (as reflected in Rahlfs). In this paragraph we will treat φιλόλογος and φιλόσοφος as equally likely possibilities. While we surmised that σοφιστής in Exodus 7:11 should be translated negatively based on the term with which it was paired, what should we say about it when it is paired here with a term like φιλόλογος/φιλόσοφος? It has been pointed out that the Old Greek translator of Daniel often refers to the Babylonian priests (*hkm*) as σοφισταί, while using the term σοφός instead when referring to Daniel himself.³⁰ Clearly the Old Greek translator does not feel that the term σοφιστής is so tainted that Daniel cannot be associated with such a profession (he even goes so far as to call him τὸν Δαυνηλ τὸν ἄρχοντα τῶν σοφιστῶν in 4:15), but

²⁸ On the strength of these scant mentions alone, Muraoka, *Lexicon*, defines μάγος as “priestly sage capable of interpreting dreams”. This definition certainly satisfies the scant Septuagint data, but almost certainly does not convey the full implications of this term in the mind of a native speaker of Greek (Jewish or otherwise) in the 2nd - 1st century BCE. See the discussion in Kittel and Friedrich, *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, V, 356-59, and the entry in Liddell-Scott, *Lexicon*, 1071. Lust et al, *Lexicon*, 287, renders “wizard, enchanter, magician”. The occurrences of this term (and its family) in Philo and Josephus are strongly negative: Philo equates the μάγος and φαρμακευτής in a list of “wicked people”, while Josephus dismisses the arts of the Egyptians in the Exodus story as μαγεία.

²⁹ Klaus Koch, *Daniel, Volume I: Daniel 1-4* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2005), anticipates this analysis: “Um dem Eindruck zu entgehen, dass die Judäer sich mit heidnischer Mantik und Beschwörungskunst befasst haben, >veredelt< G die beiden Gruppen zu >Sophisten und Philosophen<.”

³⁰ Kittel and Friedrich, *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, VII, 503: “When סוֹפֵר is used for the wise men of Babylon LXX mostly has σοφισταί...Daniel being differentiated from them as a σοφός.”

the implication is that Daniel surpasses these σοφισταί just as a true practitioner of a given art surpasses those who dabble in it (or worse, those who are charlatans).

This insight is particularly interesting when it is paired with the observation that both of these terms, σοφιστής and φιλόλογος/φιλόσοφος, carry connotations pertaining to Greek education and thought, of which the translator and his readers must surely have been aware.³¹ The translator thus seems to be making an implication about the relationship of Jewish piety to Greek thought: while the Greek σοφισταί and φιλόλογοι/φιλόσοφοι dabble in knowledge greater than themselves, the pious Jew can surpass them in knowledge and power through a right relationship with God.³² Thus, the Old Greek translator manages to use a story set in Babylon and teach lessons which applied to his contemporary Hellenistic milieu. The use of the two Greek terms is even more notable given the fact that they occur very rarely in the rest of the Septuagint: σοφιστής only occurs in Daniel and in Exodus 7:11, while φιλόσοφος occurs elsewhere only in 4 Maccabees, a book with a heavy focus on wisdom in a Greek context. The term φιλόλογος is even rarer, occurring only here in the Septuagint.

Finally, it remains to discuss the translation of the terms discussed above in the Aramaic portions of Daniel (beginning at 2:4). The trends in the two translations already noted above in the Hebrew portions of Daniel continue in its Aramaic portions: the Old Greek translation shows significant variability, while the Theodotonic translation is extremely regular. The Aramaic equivalent of *ḥrṭm* occurs five times (2:10, 2:27, 4:4, 4:6, 5:11) and all five times it is rendered by the standard ἐπαιδός in Theodotion. Meanwhile, it is lacking in the last three instances in the Old Greek, while in 2:27 it is rendered by ἐπαιδός and in 2:10 by σοφός. There is little contextual reason to see why the Old Greek translator might have chosen this, although it is worth noting that in 5:11 he sums up the trio of Hebrew terms *ḥrṭm*, *šp*, and *kšd* with the word

³¹ See R. Glenn Wooden's well-argued article "The Recontextualization of Old Greek Daniel 1", in *Of Scribes and Sages: Early Jewish Interpretation and Transmission of Scripture* (edited by Craig A. Evans, London: T&T Clark, 2004), 47-68, about the significance of using terms related to Hellenistic pedagogy to make the young Jewish boys' ascent to the head of the class at a foreign academy all the more relatable to Jews of Alexandria. In fact, he suggests that the term σοφιστής, as a synonym for another term used to describe a teacher at the tertiary level (ῥήτωρ), is not particularly negative when set within the educational context of Daniel 1 (and is hence an acceptable comparandum for the four Jewish boys).

³² See the discussion of the use of φιλόσοφος in Jewish writings of the Second Temple era in Kittel and Friedrich, *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, 179-184.

σοφούς.³³ Thus, σοφός seems to have been for the Old Greek translator a rather general, unmarked term for any kind of individual who had more knowledge than others. Meanwhile, the Aramaic equivalent of *šp* occurs six times (2:10, 2:27, 4:4, 5:10, 5:11, 5:15), and all six times it is dutifully rendered as μάγος in Theodotion. In the Old Greek, it is lacking twice (4:4, 5:15), is semi-translated once by σοφός (as in 5:11 above), and is rendered by an array of terms the other three times: by μάγος in 2:10, by φάρμακος in 2:27, and by ἐπαιδός in 5:7. It would appear that the Old Greek translator was not particularly sure what an *šp* was, but given this spread he believed that it was some kind of practitioner of shadowy supernatural arts (perhaps something approaching the English term ‘wizard’). Of course, this observation makes the term’s translation as φιλόλογος/φιλόσοφος in 1:20 stand out all the more.

In conclusion, the stories of foreign priests found in Exodus 7-9 and Daniel 1-6 forced the translators of the Septuagint to confront their own ideas not only about who and what these mysterious workers of the supernatural were, but also how Jews ought to feel about them. Their ideas on this latter question in particular were expressed through their choice of vocabulary in their Greek translations of the original stories: an Egyptian priest who was channeling genuine power from the one true God might be conceded to be an ἐπαιδός, but otherwise he could safely be labeled a φάρμακος. Meanwhile, the four Jewish boys who were taken to Babylon could not be too closely associated with the unholy arts of the μάγοι, and so they were instead granted high status in the Eastern equivalent of a Greek philosophical school. All of these translations reshape the story in subtle but clever ways, and they give us a window into the mind of the translators living in a milieu of great diversity and deliberate piety.

LUKE GORTON

University of New Mexico

lagorton@unm.edu

³³ Wooden, “Recontextualization”, suggests that this translation “seems to be a harmonization with v. 27”, although he also considers that the translator may have simply misread the Hebrew as *hkm* here.

The Hapax δυνάστευμα in 3 Kgdms 2:46c

GUY DARSHAN

The two long pluses in 3 Kgdms 2 (MT 1 Kgs 2) are among the most difficult cruces in the septuagintal text.¹ The first following the record of Joab's execution (2:35a–k), the second that of Shimei (2:46a–l), they occur between the report of David's death and the account of Solomon's reign, thereby interrupting the narrative sequence of the story of Solomon's rise to power. Containing several short notations regarding Solomon's kingdom—such as his marriage to Pharaoh's daughter (35c, f), the building of several cities in the Land of Israel (35i, 46d), and the extension of his rule from Tipsah to Gaza (46b, f, k)—they are often referred to as Miscellanies. As the following table indicates, most of the material of which they are comprised is repeated or paralleled elsewhere in the Solomonic narrative in the MT, sometimes also in 3 Kgdms 3–11:

¹ On the significance of these texts for the composition of 1 Kings: see G. Darshan, "The Long Additions in LXX 1Kings 2 (35a–k; 46a–l) and their Importance for the Question of the Literary History of 1Kings 1–11," *Tarbiz* 75 (2006), 5–50 (Hebrew). For divergent views regarding these two Miscellanies, see, for example, J. Hänel, "Die Zusätze der Septuaginta in 1 Reg 2 35a–o und 46 a–l," *ZAW* 47 (1929), 76–79; G. Krautwurst, *Studien zu den Septuagintazusätzen in 1. (3.) Könige 2 und ihren Paralleltexen* (PhD diss., Johannes Gutenberg University of Mainz, 1977); D.W. Gooding, *Relics of Ancient Exegesis: A Study of the Miscellanies in 3 Reg. 2*, MSSOTS 4 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976); E. Tov, "The LXX Additions (Miscellanies) in 1 Kings 2 (3 Reigns 2)," *Textus* 11 (1984), 89–118, esp. 113–14; F.H. Polak, "The Septuagintal Account of Solomon's Reign: Revision and Ancient Recension," in *Tenth Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Oslo 1998*, SBLSCS 51, ed. B.A. Taylor (Atlanta: SBL, 2001), 139–64, esp. 146–47; A. Schenker, *Septante et texte massorétique dans l'histoire la plus ancienne du texte de 1 Rois 2–14*, CRB 48 (Paris: Peeters, 2000); P.S.F. van Keulen, *Two Versions of the Solomon Narrative: An Inquiry into the Relationship between MT 1 Kgs. 2–11 and LXX 3 Reg. 2–11*, VTSup 104 (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2005), 265–75. Cf. also Z. Talshir, "The Reign of Solomon in the Making: Pseudo-Connections between 3 Kingdoms and Chronicles," *VT* 50 (2000), 233–49; E. Tov, "3 Kingdoms Compared with Similar Rewritten Compositions," in *Flores Florentino: Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish Studies in Honour of Florentino García Martínez*, JSJSup 122, ed. A. Hilhorst et al. (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 345–66; idem, "Three Strange Books of the LXX: 1 Kings, Esther, and Daniel Compared with Similar Rewritten Compositions from Qumran and Elsewhere," in *Die Septuaginta: Texte, Kontexte, Lebenswelten*, WUNT 219, ed. M. Karrer and W. Kraus (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 369–93, esp. 369–379. 389.

LXX ch. 2	MT chs. 3–11	LXX chs. 3–11	LXX ch. 2	MT chs. 3–11	LXX chs. 3–11
2:35a	5:9	5:9	2:46a	4:20	—
2:35b	5:10	5:10	2:46b	5:1	—
2:35c	3:1, 6:38 _b	5:14a	2:46c	?	?
2:35d	5:29	5:29	2:46d	9:17–18	10:22a
2:35e	—	—	2:46e	5:2–3	5:2–3
2:35f	11:27, 9:24	11:27, 9:9a	2:46f	5:4 _a	5:4 _a
2:35g	9:25	—	2:46g	5:4 _b	5:4 _b
2:35h	9:23	5:30	2:46h	4:2–6	4:2–6
2:35i	9:15–18	10:22a	2:46i	10:26, 5:6	10:26
2:35k	—	—	2:46k	5:1	10:26a
			2:46l	4:1	4:1

While the Miscellanies raise questions relating to the language in which they were originally composed, the history of the text, the composition of 1 Kings, and the history of ancient Israel, my focus here lies solely on v. 46c, and specifically the word *δυνάστευμα (in the accusative plural form: δυναστεύματα). This *hapax legomenon*—not only in the Septuagint but to the best of our knowledge across ancient Greek literature as a whole—has significant ramifications for the history of the text.²

I. Previous suggestions

46c having no clear counterpart in MT/LXX 3–11, all the scholars who dealt with it to date look for its parallel via the following verse (46d) and the similar passage in MT 9:17–19/LXX 10:22a. The description of Solomon building Θερμαι ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ (‘Thermai in the desert’) in 46d appears to be a corruption of the *qere* of 1 Kgs 9:18 (תְּדֹמֶר בְּמִדְבָּר) or the *ketib* of MT 1 Kgs 9:18 תִּמְר (בְּמִדְבָּר):³

² LSJ, 452, s.v. δυνάστευμα.

³ The form Θερμαι appears to have been created via metathesis from תִּמְר in an attempt to make it sound more “Greek,” resembling θέρμαι, ‘hot springs.’

Miscellanies 2:46c–d	1 Kgs 9:17–19	LXX 3 Kgdms 10:22a
46c καὶ Σαλωμων ἡρξάτο διανοίγειν τὰ δυναστεύματα τοῦ Λιβάνου,		
46d καὶ αὐτὸς ὠκοδόμησεν τὴν Θερμαὶ ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ.	18... ויבן ואת בעלת ואת 19 תמר (תדמר) במדבר בארץ ואת כל-ערי המסכנות אשר היו לשלמה ואת ערי הרקב ואת ערי הפךשים ואת חשק שלמה אשר חשק לבנות בירושלם ובלבנון ובכל ארץ ממזלתו	... ἀνήνεγκεν ὁ βασιλεὺς Σαλωμων οἰκοδομήσαι ... καὶ τὴν Ἰεθερμαθ

The first proposal to be made was that δυνάστευμα is a septuagintal neologism reflecting an etymological exegesis of the local name בעלת adduced in MT 1 Kgs 9:18.⁴ Although this is strengthened by 46d: καὶ αὐτὸς ὠκοδόμησεν τὴν Θερμαὶ ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ ‘and he built Thermai in the desert’—which resembles the second half of 1 Kgs 9:18: ואת תמר (תדמר) במדבר—Baalath already appears in the Miscellanies in 2:35i as a transliteration (Βααλαθ). In addition, while בעלת stands alone in 1 Kgs 9:18, verse 46d in the Miscellanies also refers to the ‘δυναστεύματα of Lebanon’. Since בעל(ו)ת לבנון occurs nowhere in Kings, the biblical text as a whole, or in extra-biblical literature, no good reason exists to assume that it ever existed in Hebrew, Greek, or any other language. Nor do the verb δυναστεύω, from which the noun δυνάστευμα derives, or the noun δυνάστης ever represent the Hebrew root בע"ל in the LXX.⁵

David W. Gooding tentatively suggests that δυνάστευμα reflects the Hebrew root עש"ק (cf. LXX 1 Chr 16:21), serving here as a “fanciful midrashic alternative interpretation” of the Hebrew חשק שלמה אשר in 1 Kgs 9:19:

⁴ H. Winckler, *Alttestamentliche Untersuchungen* (Leipzig: E. Pfeiffer, 1892), 175; J.A. Montgomery, “The Supplement at the End of 3 Kingdoms 2 [1 Reg 2], *ZAW* 50 (1932), 121–129, esp. 128–29; Tov, “The LXX Additions,” 98 n. 3. For the etymological exegetical technique employed by the LXX translators, see E. Tov, *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research*, 3d ed. (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2015), 188–97. Cf. also the commentary to LXX.D, 1:900. For septuagintal neologisms in general, see K. Hauspie, “Neologisms in the Septuagint of Ezekiel,” *JNSL* 27 (2001), 17–37; J.K. Aitken, “Neologisms: A Septuagint Problem,” in *Interested Readers: Essays on the Hebrew Bible in Honor of David J.A. Clines*, ed. J.K. Aitken, C. Maier, and J. Clines (Atlanta: SBL, 2013), 315–329.

⁵ See T. Muraoka, *A Greek-Hebrew/Aramaic Two-Way Index to the Septuagint* (Louvain: Peeters, 2010), 33.165.

חשק לבנות בירושלם ובלבנון ובכל ארץ ממשלתו.⁶ This thesis is overly complex, however, and even if the verb *δυναστεύω* ‘to hold power’ were somehow to be linked to the Hebrew עש"ק ‘to oppress,’ the expression “חשק/חשק of Lebanon” in 46c makes no sense.⁷

Following a similar direction, Percy S.F. van Keulen proposed that *δυνάστευμα* refers to the word ממשלתו ‘his dominion’ in 1 Kgs 9:19, thus reading: “And Solomon began to open the domains of the Lebanon.”⁸ However, this theory fails to explain why the translator created a neologism or used a *hapax legomenon* to translate such a common and simple word as ממשלה.⁹ The LXX renders other occurrences of this noun in Kings via other words—*κατάρχω* in 10:22a (MT 1 Kgs 9:19) and *ἐξουσία* in 2 Kgs 20:13 (cf. Ps 114 [LXX 113]:2; 136 [LXX 135]:8, 9). The Greek translator could easily have chosen one of these or another straightforward option, such as *ἀρχή* (Gen 1:16 [x 2]; Jer 34 [LXX 41]:1; Mic 4:18) or simply *δυναστεία* (Dan 11:5). Nor does ממשלות ‘dominions, rule’ fit the context. While in 1 Kings 17–19 ממשלה refers to Solomon’s reign, in the Miscellanies it refers to Lebanon, thereby diminishing his glory.¹⁰

II. A new proposal

In the spirit of the previous proposals—all of which revolve around MT 9:17–19—but seeking to avoid the problems they raise, I would like to propose another Hebrew equivalent to *δυνάστευμα*, also adducing MT 1 Kgs 9:17–19 and its counterpart in 2 Chr 8:4–6:

⁶ D.W. Gooding, *Relics of Ancient Exegesis: A Study of the Miscellanies in 3 Reg. 2*, MSSOTS 4 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976), 40, 122 n. 17.

⁷ See LSJ, 452–53, s.v. *δυναστεύω*; BDB, 798–99, s.v. עש"ק. The root עש"ק is frequently rendered by *καταδυναστεύω* in the LXX, however: cf. Jer 6:6; 7:6, 50:33; Hos 5:11; 12:8; Amos 4:1; Mic. 2:2; Zech 7:10.

⁸ P.S.F. van Keulen, “The Background of 3 Kgdms 2:46c,” *JNSL* 24 (1998), 91–110, esp. 101.

⁹ See Gen 1:16; 1 Kgs 9:19; 2 Kgs 20:13; 2 Chr 8:6, 32:9; Ps 103:22, 114:2, 136:8–9, 145:13; Isa 22:21, 39:2; Jer 34:1, 51:28; Dan 11:5; Mic 4:8.

¹⁰ This circumstance appears to have prompted Montgomery to translate the verb *διανοίγειν* ‘to open’ at the beginning of 46c in the sense of ‘conquer’: “he conquered the kingdoms of Lebanon”: J.A. Montgomery, “Hebraica,” *JAOS* 58 (1938), 130–39, esp. 137. Not only does no textual evidence exist for interpreting *δυνάστευμα* as “kingdoms, dynastic states, *imperia*,” however, but this reading also contravenes the view presented in the Miscellanies that Solomon’s neighbors were all at peace with him (2:46g).

Misc. 2:46c–d	1 Kgs 9:17–19	2 Chr 8:4–6
46c καὶ Σαλωμων ἡρξάτο διανοίγειν τὰ δυναστεύματα τοῦ Λιβάνου, 46d καὶ αὐτὸς ὠκοδόμησεν τὴν Θερμαι ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ.	17 וַיֵּבֶן ... 18 וְאֵת בַּעֲלָת וְאֵת תָּמָר (תְּדֹמָר) בַּמִּדְבָּר בְּאֶרֶץ 19 וְאֵת כָּל-עָרֵי הַמִּסְכְּנוֹת אֲשֶׁר הָיוּ לְשִׁלְמָה וְאֵת עָרֵי הָרֶקֶב וְאֵת עָרֵי הַפְּרָשִׁים וְאֵת חֶשֶׁק שְׁלֹמֹה אֲשֶׁר חֶשֶׁק לִבְנוֹת בִּירוּשָׁלַם וּבְלִבְנוֹן וּבְכָל אֶרֶץ מְשָׁלָתוֹ	4 וַיֵּבֶן אֶת-תְּדֹמָר בַּמִּדְבָּר וְאֵת כָּל-עָרֵי הַמִּסְכְּנוֹת אֲשֶׁר בְּנָה בְּחֶמֶת 5 וַיֵּבֶן אֶת-בֵּית חֲזָרֹן הָעֲלִיּוֹן וְאֵת-בֵּית חֲזָרֹן הַתַּחְתּוֹן עָרֵי מִצּוֹר חֲזָרֹת דְּלִתִּים וּבְרִית וְאֵת בַּעֲלָת 6 וְאֵת כָּל-עָרֵי הַמִּסְכְּנוֹת אֲשֶׁר הָיוּ לְשִׁלְמָה וְאֵת כָּל-עָרֵי הָרֶקֶב וְאֵת עָרֵי הַפְּרָשִׁים וְאֵת כָּל-חֶשֶׁק שְׁלֹמֹה אֲשֶׁר חֶשֶׁק לִבְנוֹת בִּירוּשָׁלַם וּבְלִבְנוֹן וּבְכָל אֶרֶץ מְשָׁלָתוֹ

A comparison of MT 1 Kgs 9:19/2 Chr 8:4–5 with 2:46c–46d reveals that *מסכנות* or *המסכנות* ערי may better represent the Hebrew counterpart of the Greek δυνάστευμα, lying in close proximity to תמר/תדמר like בעלת, חשק, and ממשלחו. The Septuagint customarily renders *מסכנות* as πόλεις ὄχυραί ‘strong cities,’ which the Greek translators also use to construe such phrases as ערי מבצר (Num 32:36) and ערים בצורות (Deut 3:5). This rendering of *המסכנות* ערי closely parallels the term δυνάστευμα, the basic meaning of δυναστ- being “strong.”¹¹ In ancient times, the term *המסכנות* ערי was understood also as ‘storage places’ (cf. Targum: בית אוצריא), more modern scholars adducing the Akkadian *maškanu* ‘threshing floor, agriculture settlement’ (*CAD* M/1, 369–73). This interpretation is close to LSJ rendering of δυνάστευμα defining it as ‘natural resources.’¹² In addition, *מסכנות* only occur on seven occasions in the MT (Exod 1:11; 1 Kgs 9:19; 1 Chr 8:4, 6, 16:4, 17:12, 32:28), the need for a Greek neologism to explain it is more plausible than previous proposals.¹³

¹¹ Muraoka interprets δυνάστευμα as ‘military fortification, fortress’: T. Muraoka, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint* (Leuven: Peeters, 2009), 179. For the Greek rendering in Exodus, see J.W. Weevers, *Notes on the Greek Text of Exodus*, SBLSCS 30 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990), 5; D.M. Gurtner, *Exodus: A Commentary on the Greek Text of Codex Vaticanus*, Septuagint Commentary Series (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 175.

¹² Cf. *NETS ad loc.* ‘resources of Lebanon’; LXX.D *ad loc.* ‘Reichtümer.’ *HALOT* (606a, s.v. *מסכנות*) suggests various different etymologies of the Hebrew word, all relating to the basic meaning ‘depot, stores.’ For the term in general, see also M. Cogan, *1 Kings*, AB 10 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008), 303. Cf. now K.J. Baranowski, “The Biblical Hebrew ‘Store Cities’ and an Amarna Gloss,” *VT* 67 (2017), 519–527.

¹³ Only in 2 Chr 16:4 does the translator use a single word—περίχωρος—the meaning here being quite different (‘surrounding region’): see R. Hanhart, ed., *Paralipomenon liber II*, Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum VII, 2 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2014), 235–236.

Another argument in favor of עָרֵי הַמְּסֻכָּנוֹת may be found in the LXX parallel to 1 Kgs 9:19, i.e. 3 Kgdms 10:22a. A comparison of this verse with its counterpart in the MT evinces several significant minuses:

MT 1 Kgs 9:19	LXX 10:22a ₂
וְאֵת כָּל	καὶ πάσας
עָרֵי	—
הַמְּסֻכָּנוֹת	—
אֲשֶׁר	—
הָיָה	—
לְשִׁלְמָה	—
וְאֵת עָרֵי	τὰς πόλεις
הָרֶכֶב	τῶν ἄρμάτων
—וְאֵת	καὶ πάσας
עָרֵי	τὰς πόλεις
הַפָּרָשִׁים	τῶν ἵππέων
וְאֵת חֲשֶׁק	καὶ τὴν πραγματείαν
שְׁלֹמֹה	Σαλωμων
אֲשֶׁר	ἦν
חֲשֶׁק	ἐπραγματεύσατο
לְבָנוֹת	οἰκοδομῆσαι
בִּירוּשָׁלַם	ἐν Ἱερουσαλημ
וּבְלִבְנוֹן	—
וּבְכָל	καὶ ἐν πάσῃ
אֶרֶץ	τῇ γῇ
מִמְּשָׁלָתוֹ	τοῦ μὴ κατάρξαι αὐτοῦ ¹⁴

Rather surprisingly, the pluses in MT 1 Kgs 9:19 (in comparison with LXX 10:22a) are עָרֵי הַמְּסֻכָּנוֹת and לִבְנוֹן. According to the current suggestion, these terms constitute the chief elements of 2:46c. If it is correct, the minuses in LXX 10:22a are thus not coincidental. A text similar to MT 1 Kgs 9:19 may have been divided in the LXX into 10:22a and 2:46c. Alternatively, Hebrew texts

¹⁴ The Greek text—τῇ γῇ τοῦ μὴ κατάρξαι αὐτοῦ—differs in meaning from MT here. Most LXX scholars link this with the next verse, interpreting: “so that none of the people should rule over him that was left of the Chettite and the Amorite etc.”: see L.C.L. Brenton, *The Septuagint with Apocrypha: Greek and English* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1986), 461; *NETS ad loc.* The Greek text may also be the result of a doublet in the final part of the verse—מִמְּשָׁלָתוֹ (לְכָל) אֶרֶץ לְכָל בִּירוּשָׁלַם—rather than a deliberate exegetical alteration, however.

similar to 2:46c and 10:22a may have been amalgamated into a reading similar to MT 1 Kgs 9:19 during the formation of the passage. A close reading of 1 Kgs 9:15–19, indeed, demonstrates that all the cities alluded to in this passage—Jerusalem, Hazor, Megiddo, Gezer, and Lower and Upper Beth-Horon—are located in the Land of Israel. In v. 18, the author even explicitly notes that Tamar/Tadmor lies “within the land,” thereby distinguishing it from other well-known cities of the same name in other places. The reference to “Lebanon” in v. 19 in the conclusion of this section—*וְאֵת חֶשֶׁק שְׁלֹמֹה אֲשֶׁר חֶשֶׁק לְבָנוֹת*—*בִּירוּשָׁלַם וּבְלִבְנוֹן וּבְכָל אֶרֶץ מְמִשְׁלָתוֹ*—thus does not fit the context. Nor did Lebanon constitute part of Solomon’s kingdom, the principal narrative clearly evincing that this region was ruled by Hiram, to whom Solomon sent ten thousand men each month as a levy (1 Kgs 5:26–28). According to 1 Kings 9, Solomon even gave cities to Hiram (1 Kgs 9:11–13). As numerous scholars suggest, the reference to Lebanon in 1 Kgs 9:19 may thus have been imported into the description of Solomon’s dominion in 9:19 from elsewhere. If so, LXX 10:22a may reflect an older version of the text, and the pluses in MT (“Lebanon” and *ערי המסכנות*) have been introduced from an aggadic tradition glorifying Solomon, such as those we find in the Miscellanies, more specifically from an Hebrew text similar to 2:46c.¹⁵ Whatever the status of the text reflected in LXX 10:22a, the minuses (in relation to the MT) of *ערי המסכנות* and *לבנון* appear to pertain in some way to the presence of similar terms in 2:46c.

* * *

The arguments adduced above suggest that δυνάστευμα represents the Greek rendering of *מסכנות*, and should be translated ‘strong cities’ (a neologism derived from *δυναστ*- ‘strong.’). If the Miscellanies are based on a Hebrew *Vorlage*, 46c may be reconstructed as: *ושלמה החל לפתח את ערי מסכנות הלבנון* (cf. 2 Chr 16:4) ‘And Solomon began to open the strong cities of the Lebanon.’¹⁶ The advantage of this over previous proposals is twofold. Firstly, it

¹⁵ See J.A. Montgomery and H. S. Gehman, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Kings*, ICC, (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1976), 209; J. Gray, *I and II Kings*, OTL (London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1964) 225; Cogan, *I Kings*, 303.

¹⁶ The meaning of *διανοίγειν* (most Greek manuscripts) / *ἀνοίγειν* (according to B), reconstructed herein as *לפתח*, is uncertain in this context. It may constitute an elliptical idiom signifying ‘to make something available for use’—in other words, Solomon founded the storage places: see LSJ, 145, s.v. *ἀνοίγειν* Ib. *מסכנות* likely denoting ‘storehouses,’ however, it may also be understood in light of the Hebrew idiom *פתח + אוצר*. Cf. *את-אוצרו*. *פתח ה' את-אוצרו* (Jer 50 [LXX 27]:25); *ἡνεώχθησαν θησαυροί* (Sir 43:14); *יפתח אוצרו* (4Q426 7, 3); and *ויפתח*

explains why the Greek text employs a neologism here, reflecting a relatively rare word in Hebrew (מסכנות). Secondly, it helps clarify the formation of 1 Kgs 9:19. As the comparison between MT 1 Kgs 9:19 and LXX 10:22a and additional philological-historical considerations evince, this verse did not originally include the words ובלבנון and ערי המסכנות. These were added from later materials similar to those in the Miscellanies, here from a Hebrew text similar to verse 2:46c. While we cannot know with any certainty what more was recounted about these cities of מסכנות associated with Solomon's activity, agadic traditions such as these continued to develop during the Second Temple period, as clearly evidenced in Chronicles. Adding another paragraph about these cities without a parallel in MT 1 Kings (2 Chr 8:4), the Chronicler locates them far north of his capital, as in 2:46c.

GUY DARSHAN

Department of Biblical Studies

Tel Aviv University, Faculty of Humanities

Tel Aviv, Israel

gdarshan@post.tau.ac.il

לכם את אוצרו הטוב (11Q14 lii 7). On this reading, Solomon opened up the storages places of the Lebanon. Fitting the description of the wealth that characterized Solomon's rule described in the Miscellanies, this exegesis may explain the reference to Solomon's huge meals in 2:46e.

Joyful Story: The Building of the Second Temple in 1 Esdras 5:53–62

UN SUNG KWAK*

1. Introduction

1 Esdras¹ deliberately uses 2 Chr 35–36 as a starting point for describing a certain phase in the history of Israel.² Given that “1 Esdras presents the period of the restoration,”³ the description of the destruction of the kingdom of Judah in 1 Esd 1 makes the editor’s/author’s interests clear throughout 1 Esd. However, this backdrop not only functions to enhance the theme of the restoration of Judah, it also allows the author to adopt a distinct viewpoint from which to describe the historical events. 1 Esd 1:55, which parallels Lev 26:34–35⁴ and 2 Chr 36:21, is a transitional verse representing a change in the narrative’s tone from desolation to restoration and from despair to hope. The theme of ‘land Sabbaths’ explores the idea that “exile only creates a necessary hiatus, after which life will return to its regular course; with the conclusion of the ‘land

* This is the revised version of a paper written under the guidance of Prof. Michael Segal and presented at the SBL International Meeting 2016 in Seoul.

¹ English=1 Esdras; LXX=Esdras α; Vulgate=Esdras 3. In this paper, the English translations are from “A New English Translation of the Septuagint,” in Albert Pietersma and Benjamin G. Wright, *A New English Translation of the Septuagint: And the Other Greek Translations Traditionally Included Under That Title* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007). <http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/nets/>.

For a general introduction to research on 1 Esd, see Michael F. Bird, *1 Esdras: Introduction and Commentary on the Greek Text in Codex Vaticanus* (Leiden & Boston: Brill, 2012), 1–34; Dieter Böhler, *1 Esdras*, IEKAT (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer GmbH, 2015), 13–22.

² Ralph W. Klein, “The Rendering of 2 Chronicles 35–36 in 1 Esdras,” in *Was 1 Esdras First?: An Investigation Into the Priority and Nature of 1 Esdras*, ed. Lisbeth S. Fried (Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011), 225. “First Esdras 1 is clearly based on the Hebrew text of 2 Chr 35–36, although in a form somewhat different from the Masoretic Text.”

³ Sara Japhet, “1 Esdras: Its Genre, Literary Form, and Goals,” in *Was 1 Esdras First?: An Investigation Into the Priority and Nature of 1 Esdras*, ed. Lisbeth S. Fried (Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011), 210.

⁴ Jan Joosten, “Covenant Theology in the Holiness Code,” *ZABR* 4 (1998):160–3.

Sabbaths' the time will come for its redemption."⁵ This promising standpoint is taken throughout 1 Esd; nor does the author lose this lens in the specific description of the historical event. The significance of this lens is twofold. First, the reception and inclusion of the unique theme of 'land Sabbaths' from 2 Chr 36:21 indicates that the delineation of the Israelites' restoration is influenced by the Chronicler's viewpoint. Second, in 1 Esd 1:55, the author's conscious choice of εὐδοκέω from Lev 26:34 (rather than προσδέχομαι from 2 Chr 35:21) to describe how the land takes its Sabbaths implies his attitude, contemplating the restoration of the Temple in a priestly context.⁶

This paper will show how the aforementioned lens influenced the author's account of the building of the Second Temple in 1 Esd 5:53–62 as one of the most climactic scenes manifesting the restoration of Judah. After comparing 1 Esd 5:53–62 with the parallel verses in Ezra 3:7–13, I will examine how the differences between 1 Esd and Ezra reveal the twofold significance of this lens. In the process, I will propose that viewed in this way, the building story of the Second Temple in 1 Esd 5:53–62 is an instance of *rewritten Scripture*⁷.

⁵ Sara Japhet, *I & II Chronicles* (London: SCM, 1993), 1075.

⁶ Jacob L. Wright, "Remember Nehemiah: 1 Esdras and the *Damnatio memoriae* Nehemiae," in *Was 1 Esdras First?: An Investigation Into the Priority and Nature of 1 Esdras*, ed. Lisbeth S. Fried (Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011), 145–163. Challenging Böhler's argument, Wright maintains that the author of 1 Esd, which was written after Ezra-Nehemiah, eliminates Nehemiah's account from the historical record of the restoration because "Nehemiah's account would have posed serious problems for the priestly circles" (p. 158). Although I do not accept all Wright's arguments, this paper inclines towards his position in arguing for the priestly character of 1 Esd.

⁷ H. G. M. Williamson, "The Problem with First Esdras," in *After the Exile: Essays in Honour of Rex Mason*, ed. John Barton and David J. Reimer (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1996), 201–16; repr. in idem, *Studies in Persian Period History and Historiography*, FAT 38 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004), 294–305; Kristin De Troyer, *Rewriting the Sacred Text* (Leiden & Boston: Brill, 2003), 91–126; James C. VanderKam, "Literary Questions Between Ezra, Nehemiah, and 1 Esdras," in *Was 1 Esdras First?: An Investigation Into the Priority and Nature of 1 Esdras*, ed. Lisbeth S. Fried (Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011), 131–43. As VanderKam points out, Williamson categorizes 1 Esdras as rewritten Bible. VanderKam summarises three literary-critical approaches for 1 Esdras: 1) the Fragment Hypothesis: 1 Esdras is the only surviving part of an earlier version of the Chronicler's work; 2) the Compilation Hypothesis: 1 Esdras was fashioned and reshaped from the compiler's viewpoint by taking selections from Chronicles-Ezra-Nehemiah; and 3) 1 Esdras is a distinct composition written by the Chronicler, using Ezra-Nehemiah as a source. The third option was proposed by Tamara C. Eskenazi, "The Chronicler and the Composition of 1 Esdras," *CBQ* 48:1 (1986): 39–61. To claim, as this paper does, that author of 1 Esd adopts the lens of the Chronicler does not require the identity of the two writers.

2. Evidence

Ezra 3:7 (MT and LXX); 1 Esdras 5:53

This part describes the preparation of the building of the Second Temple. One of the differences between 1 Esd 5:53 and Ezra 3:7 is that 1 Esd uses the phrase ‘διαφέρειν σχεδίας,’ which means ‘to convey in rafts.’ Two Hebrew terms are rendered σχεδίας,⁸ which appears only twice in the MT: דָּבָר in 2 Chr 2:15 and דָּבָר in 1 Kgs 5:23, which report the gathering of trees from Lebanon for the preparation of the First Temple. In this context, ‘διαφέρειν σχεδίας’ may be considered as a harmonization by the author in light of the building story of Chronicles for the First Temple.

Another perplexing word in 1 Esd 5:53 is χαρά (joy). This word is employed in the context of the preparations for the reconstruction of the temple. Food, drink and χαρά were given to the Sidonians and Tyrians in return for bringing cedar trees from Lebanon to Joppa harbour. The problem is that Ezra 3:7, the parallel verse, employs the words יָגֵן and ἔλαιον (oil) instead of χαρά. In Ezra 3:7, food, drink and oil were paid to the Sidonians and Tyrians.

Several explanations have been suggested. First, Hanhart⁹ considers χαρά to be secondary to κάρπον (a cart).¹⁰ This variant, including καρύα (nut-bearing tree),¹¹ seems to be fitting to the context in which the means of transportation for the trees is needed. However, the LXX and the Greek papyri¹² and literatures in the second–first century BCE in Alexandria, which are assumed as 1 Esdras’ translation (or composition) date and location,¹³ do not have κάρπον.

VanderKam categorises 1 Esdras as rewritten Scripture according to the compilation hypothesis, and he suggests that the story of Zerubbabel in 1 Esd, which is given more prominence here than in the book of Ezra, is evidence of this. The definition of “rewritten Scripture” is based on the views of Williamson, De Troyer, and VanderKam.

⁸ In the LXX, σχεδίας (raft) appears five times: in 1 Kings 5:23; 2 Chr 2:15; 1 Esdr 5:53; and in Wis 14:5–6.

⁹ Robert Hanhart, *Esdrae liber I* (Septuaginta VIII, 1; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1974), 101; Zipora Talshir, *1 Esdras: A Text Critical Commentary*, Septuagint and Cognate Studies 50 (Atlanta, GA: Society for Biblical Literature, 2001), xi, 302. On this issue, Hanhart, who usually follows the MS Vaticanus (B-Text), prefers the Lucianic MSS (L-text).

¹⁰ NETS adopts this reading.

¹¹ καρύα (nut tree) occurs only once in Song 6:11. Another variant is καρπός (fruit). However, it does not appear at all in Ezra, 1 Esd, or 1 and 2 Chronicles. καρπός appears only three times: in Neh 9:36, 10:36, and 10:38.

¹² <https://papyri.uni-koeln.de/papyri-woerterlisten/index.html>

¹³ Bird, *1 Esdras*, 6–7.

Given that κάρρον first appears in the second century CE in Alexandria,¹⁴ it would be possible that χαρά was amended to κάρρα in later translation (or recension) work.¹⁵ In addition, although these variants, κάρρον and καρύα, are suggestive, as Talshir points out, “it totally neglects the relationship between this reading and Ezra’s parallel שמן.”¹⁶

Second, Rudolph suggests that χαρά comes from the internal Greek corruption of χρῖμα.¹⁷ This solution may be tested by the question: “If the *Vorlage* 1 Esd had שמן, is it reasonable to suppose that the translator rendered שמן as χρῖμα?” Although χρῖμα denotes oil, the LXX does not use this word elsewhere. Instead, the LXX employs only the term χρῖσμα, and the author of 1 Esd uses the word ἔλαιον for שמן in 1 Esd 6:29. In addition, where χρῖσμα does occur, it translates הקדש (cf. Ex 29:7; 30:25; 35:17, 19; 40:9, 15; Dan 9:26). In the MT, the term הקדש is used differently from שמן. While the former indicates the holy oil used in the consecrations, the latter is the basic and usual word denoting oil.¹⁸ The term הקדש is also followed by שמן. In the MT, the term שמן, occurs 22 times, accompanied by the word שמן to denote ‘anointing oil,’ except in Exod 29:29 and 40:15. In this regard, if the LXX has the term χρῖμα, it means that the *Vorlage* would be ‘שמן הקדש.’ However, Ezra and Nehemiah in the MT do not use the term הקדש, nor does the usage of the term seem to match with the context (2 Chr 2:9).

Third, Talshir insists that “χαρά reflects a different *Vorlage* such as ושמחה; see 5:61 (3:12) שמחה ≈ χαρά. It could have been caused by an abbreviated שמ or by metathesis of משחה, a synonym of שמן.”¹⁹ For instance, in Dan 9:24, the verbal form ‘משח (to anoint)’ is rendered by εὐφραίνω, which means to rejoice. This could be caused by metathesis to שמח (to rejoice). If the author of 1 Esd used the term χαρά for שמחה, this is very suggestive. However, the noun form שמחה and the verbal form שמח in the MT is usually rendered by εὐφραίνω

¹⁴ <http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu>, TLG (Thesaurus Linguae Graecae) statistics.

¹⁵ R. Glenn Wooden, “2 Esdras,” in *The T&T Clark Companion to the Septuagint*, ed. James K. Aitken (London - New York, NY: Bloomsbury, 2015), 196. “2 Esdras seems to be among the latest of the translations of the Jewish Scriptures, originating in the latter half of the second century C.E.”

¹⁶ Talshir, *1 Esdras: A Text Critical Commentary*, 302.

¹⁷ Talshir, *1 Esdras: A Text Critical Commentary*, 302.

¹⁸ BDB, 609–10.

¹⁹ Talshir, *1 Esdras: A Text Critical Commentary*, 302. Talshir points out that in this case one has to rely on the Aramaic משה (the general word for oil), whereas in Hebrew משהח is used only in specific contexts. 1 Esd 6:29, the parallel verse of Ezra 6:9 in the Aramaic portion, gives ἔλαιον as an equivalent of משה (oil in Aramaic).

(verb) and εὐφοροσύνη (noun) in Ezra, Nehemiah and Chronicles.²⁰ In addition, given that “the account in 1 Esdras, via Ezra, is largely dependent upon descriptions of the first temple narrated in 1 Chr 22:2–4 and 2 Chr 2:7–15,”²¹ the following question remains: “Did the author of 1 Esd not know the bartering materials – food, drink and oil – in the building story for the First Temple?”

Fourth, in my opinion, the author of 1 Esd may use χαρά as part of his or her purpose in emphasizing that the building of the Second Temple, from the preparation to the completion, is a joyful story, and that all the people who participated in this work were joyful. In 1 Esd 5:61, χαρά appears to represent the joy of the Israelites at the building of the foundations of the Second Temple. Further, 1 Esd 4:63 describes Zerubbabel and his kindred drinking with music and χαρά at receiving permission to build the temple. Similarly, although the context is different, the Israelites eat and drink before the LORD with great χαρά in 1 Chr 29:22. Finally, in 1 Kgs 5:21, Hiram, who prepared the cedar trees, rejoiced (χαίρω) after hearing the report of the building of the First Temple. According to these observations, I would argue that the author of 1 Esd purposefully employed the word χαρά to stress that the preparations for building the Second Temple were a great joy for all the people involved, even foreigners and workers.²²

Furthermore, in Ezra, נֶשֶׁךְ and its Aramaic equivalent נִשְׁכָּ appear three times, in Ezra 3:7, 6:9 and 7:22. Interestingly, while נִשְׁכָּ (occurring in a decree that issued by King Cyrus in Ezra 6:9) is rendered by ἔλαιον in 1 Esd 6:29, the rendering of נֶשֶׁךְ in the letter of King Artaxerxes (Ezra 7:22) does not appear in 1 Esd 8:20. Considering the reconstruction under Zerubbabel that happened during the reign of Darius (1 Esd 5:53), ‘oil’ is only mentioned in the decree of King Cyrus. This means that, in 1 Esd, the Israelites did not use ‘oil’ as a trading material or as a royal gift. In this regard, it seems to be possible that the Vorlage of 1 Esd 5:53 does not have ‘oil’ or that χαρά might be considered

²⁰ Ezra 3:12–13; 6:22; Neh 8:12, 17; 12:27, 43–44; 1 Chr 12:41; 15:16, 25; 16:10, 31; 29:9, 17, 22; 2 Chr 6:41; 7:10; 15:15; 20:27; 23:13, 18, 21; 24:10; 29:30, 36; 30:21, 23, 25–26. Two exceptions are: 1 Chr 29:22, which renders נֶשֶׁךְ as χαρά, and 2 Chr 24:10, which renders נֶשֶׁךְ as δίδωμι.

²¹ Bird, *1 Esdras*, 205.

²² Talshir, *1 Esdras: A Text Critical Commentary*, 302. χαρά appears in the B-text and is employed in the Latin, Syriac and Aethiopian daughter translations. And, Josephus (Ant. 11:78) describes it as “τοῖς τε Σιδωνίοις ἡδὺ καὶ κοῦφον ἦν τὰ τε κέδρινα κατάγουσιν ἐκ τοῦ Λιβάνου ξύλα...” (And Sidonians were pleasant and voluntary to bring the trees from Lebanon).

a scribal intervention to emphasize the joy involved in the building of the Second Temple.

Although we do not know the exact answer why the author of 1 Esd used the term χαρά, the text shows the Israelites and foreigners apparently beginning to build the Temple with pleasure and joyfulness.

Ezra 3:8 (MT and LXX); 1 Esdras 5:54–55

Both Ezra 3:8 and 1 Esd 5:54 describe the building of the house of the LORD as beginning in the second month after the coming of Zerubbabel and Jeshua in the second year.²³ However, Ezra does not have a parallel verse to 1 Esd 5:55, which emphasizes laying the foundation of the temple of the LORD during ‘the new moon (νοῦμηνία)’ of the second month in the second year. As Solomon began to build the house of the LORD in Jerusalem in ‘the second month’ of the fourth year of his reign (1 Kgs 6:1; 2 Chr 3:2), the Second Temple was begun in ‘the second month.’ If so, why did the author of 1 Esd repeat the phrase ‘the second month in the second year’, while adding νοῦμηνία in 1 Esd 5:55?

The reiteration of the phrase ‘the second month in the second year’ and the addition of the word νοῦμηνία may imply the author’s deliberate intervention to emphasize the restoration and rebuilding of the Temple, viewed through the Chronicler’s lens and from the perspective of the priestly circle. First, as the tabernacle was erected on the first day of the first month at νοῦμηνία in the priestly source (Exod 4:2 and 17), νοῦμηνία is an allusion to hope for the erection of the Second Temple. Second, as Solomon manifests that one of the purposes of building the house of the LORD is to offer burnt offerings on the Sabbaths and the νοῦμηνία and the other feasts of the LORD (2 Chr 2:3), νοῦμηνία may indicate the restoration of the purpose and function of the Temple. Regarding 2 Chr 2:3, another piece of evidence that the author employs the lens of the Chronicler appears in 1 Esd 5:51. The purpose of the Temple and its importance in the rituals in 2 Chr 2:3 does not appear in 1 Kgs 5, which is a parallel chapter. However, the words and their sequence in 2 Chr 2:3, ‘σάββατον, νοῦμηνία and ἑορτή,’ appear in 1 Esd 5:51, even though the parallel verse Ezra 3:5 does not contain the word σάββατον.²⁴ On the one hand, the order of the sacrifices could be understood as resulting from the translator’s use of the Chronicler’s lens and priestly sources (Num 28–29). On the other

²³ Bird, *1 Esdras*, 205. “1 Esdras hints at a correction to Ezra 3:1–15 by placing Zorobabel’s return and reconstruction efforts during Darius’s reign (note that in 5:54 the *L* text adds δαπείου to underscore this fact further).”

²⁴ Ezra does not have σάββατον.

hand, σάββατον recalls the ‘land Sabbaths’ in 1 Esd 1:55, which is the covenantal term for the restoration of Judah.

Although the building of the Second Temple was not completed, the repetition of ‘the second month in the second year’ may have a rhetorical effect and indicate the conviction that the Temple would eventually be rebuilt. The author of 1 Esd, who knew the significance of νομηνία in priestly legislations and Chronicles, may have emphasized that the Temple would be restored.

Ezra 3:9 (MT and LXX); 1 Esdras 5:56

These verses list the specific names of the Levites supervising and directing the workmen in the temple. Although there is no difference between MT and LXX in Ezra, two different names appear in 1 Esd, ‘Ημαδαβουν’ and ‘Ιλιαδουν’, and these names occur only one time in the LXX. In the assumption that the name ‘חננד’ and ‘Hvaδaδ’ in Ezra 3:9 indicate ‘Hmadaboun’ in 1 Esd 5:56, Table_1²⁵ shows the matching of the names between Ezra and 1 Esd.

²⁵ Dominique Barthélemy, *Les devanciers d’Aquila*, VTSup 10 (Leiden : Brill, 1963) ; Dominique Barthélemy, “Prise de position sur les autres communications du colloque de Los Angeles,” in *Études d’Histoire du Texte de l’Ancien Testament*, ed. Dominique Barthélemy, OBO 21 (Fribourg : Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978), 267-9; Timothy Janz, “The Second Book of Ezra and the ‘Kaige Group,’” in *IX Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies*, Cambridge, 1995, ed. B. A. Taylor, SBLSCS 45 (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1997), 154-70; R. Glenn Wooden, “Interlinearity in 2 Esdras,” in *Septuagint Research: Issues and Challenges in the study of the Greek Jewish Scriptures*, ed. Wolfgang Kraus and R. Glenn Wooden (Leiden: Brill, 2006), 119-144. In particular see 122-4; Siegfried Kreuzer, “Toward the Old Greek: New Criteria for the Analysis of the Recensions of the Septuagint (especially the Antiochene/Lucianic Text and the Kaige Recension),” in *XIII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies: Ljubljana, 2007*, ed. M. H. Peters (Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008), 239-53; reprinted in Siegfried Kreuzer, *The Bible in Greek: Translation, Transmission, and Theology of the Septuagint*, SBLSCS 63 (Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2015), 113-28.

Janz lays out the various *kaige*-features in 2 Esd (the LXX Ezra) based on the work of Barthélemy, who firstly considered 2 Esd as the *kaige*-recension. Although Janz does not consider these *kaige* features as the evidences for a recensional development of 2 Esd, Janz places 2 Esd into the *kaige*-group. This position leads to two possibilities. 1) the translator of 2 Esd is a member of the *kaige*-group or someone influenced by *kaige* material. 2) The -*kaige*-group would have been influenced by the translator. However, Wooden is skeptical that 2 Esd should be categorized in the *kaige*-group. Recently, Kreuzer suggests that a deletion of an article (or sometimes addition) is a new criterion to evaluate the *kaige*-recension.

	Ezra 3:9 in MT	Ezra 3:9 in LXX		1 Esdras 5:56
1	יֵשׁוּעַ בְּנֵי וְאֶחָיו Jeshua and his sons and his brothers	Ἰησοῦς καὶ οἱ υἱοὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ Jeshua and his sons and his brothers	→	Ἰησοῦς καὶ οἱ υἱοὶ καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ Jeshua and the sons and the brothers
2	קַדְמִיֶּל וְבָנָיו Kadmiel and his sons	Καδμιηλ καὶ οἱ υἱοὶ αὐτοῦ Kadmiel and his sons	→	Καδμιηλ ὁ ἀδελφὸς Kadmiel the brother
3	בְּנֵי־יְהוּדָה Sons of Judah	υἱοὶ Ἰουδα Sons of Judah	↘	οἱ υἱοὶ Ἰησοῦ Ἡμαδαβουν the sons of Jeshua Emadabun
4	בְּנֵי חֲנַנְדָּד בְּנֵיהֶם וְאֶחָיו Sons of Henadad, their sons and their brothers	υἱοὶ Ηναδαδ, υἱοὶ αὐτῶν καὶ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτῶν Sons of Henadad, their sons and their brothers	↗	οἱ υἱοὶ Ἰωδα τοῦ Ἰλιαδουν σὺν τοῖς υἱοῖς καὶ ἀδελφοῖς the sons of Judah son of Iliadoun with their sons and kin- dred
5	הַלֵּוִיִּם Levites	οἱ Λευῖται the Levites	→	πάντες οἱ Λευῖται all the Levites

Table 1

In this table, the relationship between Ezra and 1 Esd is unclear. All we know is that the author of 1 Esd has his or her own list of names. The author of 1 Esd may share with the author of Ezra a common source for the list of names and then modify this on the basis of other knowledge.

Ezra 3:10 (MT and LXX); 1 Esdras 5:57

Following his comment, this table shows another *kaige*-feature of 2 Esd. In segments 3 and 4, while 1 Esd (as the older style) employs the article in accordance with correct Greek grammar, 2 Esd does not use the article where there is no article in the Hebrew *Vorlage*. In segment 1, the article may be necessitated by αὐτοῦ.

These verses show the priests and the Levites praising the LORD after laying the foundation of the Second Temple. In Ezra 3:10, two consecutive words, מלבושים (vestments) and חצצרה (trumpet), portray the appearance of the priests. These two words are rendered into ἐστολισμένοι and ὀλπιγξ in the LXX-Ezra 3:10. However, 1 Esd 5:57 puts another word μουσικός (musical instrument) between ἐστολισμένοι and ὀλπιγξ. This term appears 18 times in the LXX, and corresponds with the Hebrew term שִׁיר or the Aramaic זמר.²⁶ Why did the author of 1 Esd use the term μουσικός, the corresponding word of שִׁיר? Talshir suggests that it could have been created or lost by mistake (dittography or haplography), because בְּשִׁירִים is similar to the end of the previous word מלבושים.²⁷ Although we cannot entirely exclude the possibility of a scribal error or mis-translation in explaining this difference, the term ‘μουσικός’ could be considered as evidence indicating that the author of 1 Esd rewrote the building story through the lens of the Chronicler. The words שִׁיר and חצצרה co-occur eight times in the MT, all in Chronicles,²⁸ and all uses of these words are related to praising the LORD. In particular, 1 Esd 5:57 echoes the praising scene in 2 Chr 5:12–13 for the First Temple. These verses show the strong bond between the words שִׁיר and חצצרה, implying praise of the LORD. The author of 1 Esdras, who adopts the lens of the Chronicler, emphasizes that the Temple was rebuilt by the mercy and goodness of the LORD and that the Israelites rejoiced in the restoration of the Temple.

1 Esd 5:57 also uses the word εὐλογέω (to bless), which does not appear in Ezra 3:10. εὐλογέω could also be considered as evidence of the Chronicler’s lens. The preceding scene of praising the LORD, and the following phrase ‘κατὰ Δαυὶδ βασιλέα τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ’, could hint at why the author of 1 Esd added the word ‘εὐλογέω.’ First, in 1 Chr 16:2, after the burnt and peace offerings, David blesses the people in the name of the LORD. Second, in 1 Chr 16:42–43, after offering and praising with trumpets, cymbals and songs, and the departing of the people, David goes home to bless his household. Third, in 1 Chr 29:10, after David and his people freely offer gold, silver and treasures for the First Temple, David blesses the LORD in the presence of all the assembly. Fourth, in 1 Chr 29:20, after David prays for Solomon and the First Temple, David says to all the assembly, “Bless the LORD your God,” and all those assembled bless the LORD, the God of their fathers, and bow their heads and

²⁶ Gen 31:27; 1 Esdr 4:63; 5:2, 57; 1 Mac 9:39, 41; Sir 22:6; 32:3, 5–6; 40:20; 44:5; 49:1; Ezek 26:13; Dan 3:5, 7, 10, 15.

²⁷ Talshir, *1 Esdras: A Text Critical Commentary*, 310.

²⁸ 1 Chr 13:8; 16:42; 2 Chr 5:12–13; 7:6; 23:13; 29:27–28

pay homage to the LORD and to the king. In these verses, we note that ‘blessing’ is one of David’s routines after completing the offerings to the LORD. In this regard, εὐλογέω is one of the ways 1 Esd rewrites the narrative through the lens of the Chronicler to demonstrate the restoration of the inner and outer integrity of the Temple: the restoration of the sacrificing rituals as well as the restoration of the edifice itself.

Ezra 3:11 (MT and LXX); 1 Esdras 5:58–59

These verses describe the Israelites praising the LORD for laying the foundation of the house of the LORD. Two major differences between Ezra and 1 Esd are evident. First, 1 Esd 5:59 adds a scene in which the people play trumpets, which Ezra does not mention. I will deal with the term ‘trumpet’ (σάλπιγξ) in the next part. Second, 1 Esd 5:58 uses different words in the eulogy to the LORD. As Table 2 shows, the eulogy in Ezra 3:11 is the same as the eulogy in 1 Chr 16:34, 2 Chr 5:13 and 2 Chr 7:3 praising the LORD for the return of the Ark of God and the completion of the First Temple. In these observations, we may find some features of the relationship between Chronicles, Ezra and 1 Esd. First, there is a common eulogy to praise to the LORD for His dwelling place: the Ark of God and the house of the LORD. Second, 1 Esd does not follow this common eulogy, which appears in Chronicles and Ezra.

	MT	LXX
1 Chr 16:34	כִּי טוֹב כִּי לַעֲוֹלָם חֲסֵדוֹ	ὅτι ἀγαθόν, ὅτι εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τὸ ἔλεος αὐτοῦ.
2 Chr 5:13	כִּי טוֹב כִּי לַעֲוֹלָם חֲסֵדוֹ	ὅτι ἀγαθόν, ὅτι εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τὸ ἔλεος αὐτοῦ.
2 Chr 7:3	כִּי טוֹב כִּי לַעֲוֹלָם חֲסֵדוֹ	ὅτι ἀγαθόν, ὅτι εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τὸ ἔλεος αὐτοῦ.
Ezra 3:11	כִּי טוֹב כִּי לַעֲוֹלָם חֲסֵדוֹ עַל־יְשׁוּעָאֵל	ὅτι ἀγαθόν, ὅτι εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τὸ ἔλεος αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ Ἰσραηλ.
1 Esd 5:58		ὅτι ἡ <i>χρηστότης</i> αὐτοῦ καὶ ἡ <i>δόξα</i> εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας παντὶ Ἰσραηλ.

Table 2

In the MT of Ezra 3:11, the Israelites praise God's **יְהוָה** and **דָּוָה**, which are usually rendered into ἀγαθός and ἔλεος.²⁹ However, 1 Esd employs the words χρηστότης and δόξα. While χρηστότης could be regarded as a synonym of ἀγαθός, it is clearly distinct from the vocabulary of Ezra-Nehemiah, which does not have χρηστότης.

In addition, instead of ἔλεος, 1 Esd employs δόξα, which does not appear in Ezra (Hebrew equivalents **דָּוָה** or **יְהוָה**). In 1-2 Chr, **דָּוָה** (ἔλεος) appears to describe the nature of the LORD in the eulogy, and it is accompanied by the appearance of the LORD's δόξα. For instance, the eulogy in 1 Chr 16:34 is followed by David's thanksgiving praise for the **דָּוָה** of the LORD in 1 Chr 16:27–29. Second, the eulogy in 2 Chr 5:13 is accompanied by the presence of the LORD, in that the **דָּוָה** of the LORD fills the First Temple in 2 Chr 5:14. Third, in 2 Chr 7:1–3, after the Israelites see that the **דָּוָה** of the LORD fills the First Temple, they praise the LORD with the eulogy. In this regard, δόξα seems to combine the eulogy with the presence of the LORD in His dwelling place. The author of 1 Esd abridges and amalgamates the eulogy with the LORD's appearance in the Second Temple into the word δόξα. This may be evidence to show that 1 Esd rewrites the building story of the Second Temple in keeping with the Chronicler's lens rather than copying the building story from Chronicles and Ezra. As Bird points out, "This hymnic praise is reminiscent of Zorobabel's exclamation of praise upon his victory at the contest in Darius's court (1 Esd 4:40)."³⁰ Furthermore, following the priestly context, δόξα in 1 Esd implies that the restoration of the Temple is fulfilled in the presence of the glory of the LORD (Exod 40:34 and Num 14:10).

Ezra 3:12–13 (MT and LXX); 1 Esdras 5:60–62

The main contents of these verses are the weeping, shouting and joy of the Israelites, who see the foundation of the house of the LORD. While the contents of Ezra and 1 Esd are not significantly different from each other, the methods of description vary. While Ezra expresses the feelings and behavior of the Israelites directly, the author of 1 Esd describes it metaphorically. The crucial metaphor is σάλπιγξ (trumpet). First, the author of 1 Esd employs σάλπιγξ to describe the joy of the Israelites in 1 Esd 5:61, though the parallel verse, Ezra 3:12, does not use this word. Second, Ezra 3:13 describes the sound of the Israelites' weeping by comparing it with a joyful shout. However, the

²⁹ 'טוֹב' occurs 40 times in Ezra, Neh, and Chr. Two Greek terms appear for 'טוֹב': 'ἀγαθός' and 'καλός.' 'דָּוָה' occurs 24 times in Ezra, Neh, and Chr. 'דָּוָה' is rendered into 'ἔλεος', except in 2 Chr 35:26.

³⁰ Bird, *1 Esdras*, 207.

author of 1 Esd alludes to the weeping sound by comparing it with the sound of σάλπιγξ. Third, in the preceding verse, the author of 1 Esd uses the word σάλπιγξ to describe the Israelites, who praise the LORD. Fourth, in 1 Esd 5:63, the adversaries of Judah and Benjamin learn what the sound of the trumpets means, and they notice that the returned exiles are building the temple for the LORD. The sound of trumpets is the metaphor implying the building of the Second Temple; in Ezra 4:1, however (the parallel verse of 1 Esd 5:63, the sound of trumpets is not mentioned.

What is the implication of this word? Why did the author of 1 Esd employ it? The Hebrew noun תְּרֻמָּה (trumpet), the equivalent of σάλπιγξ, appears 29 times in the MT.³¹ Interestingly, it appears 21 times in the priestly text (Num) and 1–2 Chronicles in the context that the LORD is praised by the priests blowing a trumpet. First, σάλπιγξ is used as an instrument to praise the LORD before the Ark of God (1 Chr 13:8; 15:28; 16:6, 42). Second, the priests praise the LORD with σάλπιγξ after the completion of the First Temple in the cloud of the glory of God (2 Chr 5:12–13). Third, after Solomon's prayer, the priests play the trumpet during the inauguration ceremony of the First Temple before the Israelites (2 Chr 7:6). Fourth, after the consecration of the temple in the reformation of Hezekiah, the priests praise the LORD with trumpets (2 Chr 29:26ff). Fifth, in Num 10:8–10 (cf. Num 31:6), before war, trumpets should be blown by the priests. In these contexts in Chronicles and in priestly texts, σάλπιγξ emphasizes the role of the priests in the joyful ceremony before the Ark and the Temple.

3. Conclusion

In this paper, I have attempted a text-critical analysis for 1 Esd 5:53–62 (the story of the building of the Second Temple) compared with the parallel verses in Ezra 3:7–13. In this methodology, I adduced that the variances between 1 Esd and Ezra, 'διαφέρειν σχεδίας', 'νουμηνία', 'μουσικός', 'εὐλογέω', 'δόξα', and 'σάλπιγξ,' have a deep correlation with Chronicles and with priestly texts. This affinity is not confined to the lexical dimension; the author, who recognized the usage and significance of the words employed in Chronicles and the priestly texts, accepted the words and their implication. For this reason, I have argued that 1 Esd 5:53–62 is a *rewritten Scripture* viewed through the lens of the Chronicler and motivated by the desire to underscore the fulfillment of the

³¹ Num 10:2, 8–10; 31:6; 2 Kings 11:14; 12:14; Hos 5:8; Psa 98:6; Ezra 3:10; Neh 12:35, 41; 1 Chr 13:8; 15:24, 28; 16:6, 42; 2 Chr 5:12–13; 13:12, 14; 15:14; 20:28; 23:13; 29:26–28.

restoration of the Temple and its purpose after “the land takes pleasure in its Sabbaths” (1 Esd 1:55), and to represent the achievement of the joyful hope of the restoration transmitted from Lev 26:34 within the priestly circle via 2 Chr 35:21.

Furthermore, as Böhler points out,³² these textual variances of 1 Esd hint at the literary shape of 1 Esd. It seems likely that the Ezra tradition, which was shared with the MT Ezra, is the source of 1 Esd.³³ Based on this tradition, the author may have rewritten the building story by emphasizing the role of Zerubbabel in keeping with the Chronicler’s lens and motivations as mentioned above. The focal point on which the author of 1 Esd concentrated was consistently the restoration of the Temple,³⁴ the joyful story for both the Israelites and the foreigners who participated in the task.

UN SUNG KWAK

University of Oxford

Oxford, Great Britain

un.kwak@sjc.ox.ac.uk

³² Dieter Böhler, “On the Relationship between Textual and Literary Criticism: The Two Recensions of the Book of Ezra: Ezra-Neh (MT) and 1 Esdras (LXX),” in *The Earliest Text of the Hebrew Bible: The Relationship between the Masoretic Text and the Hebrew Base of the Septuagint Reconsidered*, ed. Adrian Schenker. SBLSCS 52 (Atlanta, GA: Society Biblical Literature; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 35–50. The present paper follows the methodology of Böhler, who acknowledged the methodological remarks of Wilhelm Rudolph and Emmanuel Tov. He attempted to present the literary shape of 1 Esd by inquiring into small textual differences between the parallel material of the two versions.

³³ David M. Carr, “A Response,” in *Revisiting the Composition of Ezra-Nehemiah: In Conversation with Jacob Wright’s Rebuilding Identity: The Nehemiah Memoir and its Earliest Readers*, ed. Gary Knoppers, special issue, *JHS* 12 (2007): 17. Regarding the book of Nehemiah, there is still controversy over whether the Ezra and Nehemiah traditions were separate or united at the outset. One may identify three different positions: 1) Böhler: two separate traditions of Ezra and Nehemiah: 1 Esd → the MT Ezra, fitting with the inserted Nehemiah story (priority of 1 Esd), 2) Talshir: the insertion of the story of the three guardsmen and the replacement of the figure of Nehemiah with the figure of Zerubbabel (priority of the MT Ezra) and 3) Wright: a unity of the Ezra-Nehemiah tradition → a deletion of Nehemiah’s memoirs → 1 Esdras (priority of the MT Ezra).

³⁴ Vanderkam, “Literary Questions Between Ezra, Nehemiah and 1 Esdras,” 143.

The Righteous King in LXX Isa 32:1-4: Hope and Ideology in Translation

RODRIGO FRANKLIN DE SOUSA

Introduction

The portrayal of the righteous king in LXX Isa 32:1-4 displays some noteworthy differences from the Masoretic version of the same passage. In this paper, I attempt to highlight and explain these differences, by means of a comparative analysis of the Greek and Hebrew versions of the oracle, with the assumption that the Hebrew represents a proto-Masoretic text form. The analysis will deal with lexical and syntactical choices, and reading strategies of the translator.¹

Below we offer a parallel translation of the MT and LXX of the passage, followed by a study of the translated version. The following elements will be observed more closely: (1) the representation of the royal figure in verse 1; (2) the articular use of ὁ ἄνθρωπος in verse 2; (3) the imagery of flooding also in verse 2; (4) the deviating rendering καὶ οὐκέτι ἔσονται πεποιθότες ἐπ' ἀνθρώποις in verse 3; (5) the use of the phrase λαλεῖν εἰρήνην at the end of verse 4; (6) the use of ἰδοὺ γὰρ and the question of context in the interpretation of LXX Isaiah.

Text and Translation

Isa 32:1

MT

LXX

יְהוָה	ἰδοὺ γὰρ
לִפְנֵי יְהוָה יִשְׁפָּט	βασιλεὺς δίκαιος βασιλεύσει καὶ
וְלִפְנֵי יְהוָה יִשְׁפָּט	ἄρχοντες μετὰ κρίσεως ἄρξουσιν

Behold

For behold

¹ A draft version of this paper was presented at the IOSCS unit of the Annual Meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature 2015, in Atlanta.

A king shall reign *according to*
righteousness
And rulers² shall rule *according to*
judgment

A righteous king shall reign
And rulers shall rule *according to* judg-
ment

Isa 32:2

MT

וְהָיָה אִישׁ כְּמִתְבָּא־רוּחַ
וְסִתְרָה נֶרְם
כְּפִלְגִי־מִיָּם
כְּצִיּוֹן
כְּצֹל סֶלַע־כֶּבֶד
כְּאֶרֶץ עֲרִפָּה

And each shall be like a shelter from
wind
and a protection from tempest
Like streams of water in a dry place
Like the shadow of a great rock in a
weary land

LXX

καὶ ἔσται ὁ ἄνθρωπος κρύπτων τοὺς
λόγους αὐτοῦ
καὶ κρυβήσεται
ὥς ἀφ' ὕδατος φερομένου
καὶ φανήσεται ἐν Σίῳ
ὥς ποταμὸς φερόμενος ἐνδοξος
ἐν γῇ διψώσῃ
And a man shall be hiding his words
and will be hidden as (if) carried by
water
and shall be manifest in Zion
As a glorious river flowing in a thirsty
land

Isa 32:3

MT

וְלֹא תִשְׁעִינָה עֵינֵי רְאִים
וְאָזְנֵי שְׁמָעִים תִּקְשְׁבֶנָּה

And the eyes of those who see will not
be shut
And the ears of those who hear will be
attentive

LXX

καὶ οὐκέτι ἔσονται πεποιθότες ἐπ'
ἀνθρώποις
ἀλλὰ τὰ ὅσα δώσουσιν ἀκούειν
And no longer shall they be trusting in
men
but they shall lend the ears to hear

Isa 32:4

MT

וְלִבְבֵי נִמְהָרִים
יִבְּיוּ לְדָעַת
וְלִשְׁוֹן עֲלֵגִים
תִּמְהָר לְדַבֵּר צָחוֹת

LXX

καὶ ἡ καρδία τῶν ἀσθενούντων
προσέξει τοῦ ἀκούειν
καὶ αἱ γλῶσσαι αἱ ψελλίζουσai
ταχὺ μαθήσονται λαλεῖν εἰρήνην

² None of the Greek and Latin versions have an equivalent for ל before שרים. This lends weight to the suggestion of H. Wildberger, *Isaiah 28-39*, (trans. T. H. Trapp; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2002), 341, that the ל is the result of copyist's error in the MT.

And the heart of those who hasten	And the heart of those who are weak-
Will be wise to understand	ened
And the tongue of those who stammer	Shall devote itself to hear
	And the tongue of the ones who falter in
Shall be ready to speak clearly	speech
	shall quickly learn to speak peace

Focus on the Royal Figure

As far as the lexical choices are concerned, LXX Isa 32:1 is very simple. The rendering of the pairs מלך/שׂר and משפט/צדק follows standard equivalences found throughout the LXX. Departing somewhat from his translation technique, whereby he often avoids the repetition of roots due to considerations of style, the translator also preserves the form of roots, possibly due to the difficulty in finding other suitable equivalents.

Syntactically, one notes that the preposition ל, both before צדק and משפט refers to a standard to which the pattern of rule must conform.³ The LXX translates the preposition somewhat literally in the case of למשפט, with the rendering μετὰ κρίσεως. However, in the case of לצדק, the option for the attributive use of the adjective δίκαιος to qualify the noun βασιλεὺς focuses on the figure of a righteous king. This creates syntactic and semantic contrast with the Hebrew, where the use of ל, together with the emphatic combination of forms of the root מלך, stresses the desire for a righteous rule by the king. The LXX rendering focuses on the person of the king himself, and stresses his righteous character.

The Identity of “the Man”

Another issue that draws attention is the rendering of the anarthrous אִישׁ with the articular form ὁ ἄνθρωπος. The Hebrew presents a quite common idiom, normally translated into English as “each one”, or “each man”. The use of the articular form seems at first sight to bypass this normal idiomatic use of אִישׁ and indicate that a specific man is in view. The focus on the person of the king in 32:1 would seem to reinforce this. This interpretation becomes especially tempting in the light of existing proposals to take ἄνθρωπος as a messianic title, in connection with LXX Num 24:7, 17 and LXX Isa 19:20.

³ Following P. Joüon and T. Muraoka, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*. Third Reprint of the Second Edition (Rome: Gregorian & Biblical Press, 2011), §133d, 458-460.

In Num 24:7, the enigmatic MT reads יזלמים מדליו וזרעו במים רבים (“Water shall flow from his buckets, and his seed shall be in many waters”), while the LXX has the rendering ἐξελεύσεται ἄνθρωπος ἐκ τοῦ σπέρματος αὐτοῦ καὶ κυριεύσει ἐθνῶν πολλῶν (“A man shall come out of his seed and shall rule many nations”). The unexpected presence of ἄνθρωπος in the verse has led to some speculation regarding the possibility of a messianic interpretation.⁴ This is reinforced by the fact that in verse 17 שבט (“sceptre”) is rendered by ἄνθρωπος instead of the more direct and standard equivalent ῥάβδος.⁵ Horbury argues that the choice of ἄνθρωπος in verse 17 is intended to “identify the star-victor of verse 17 with the emperor of verse 7”, which would seem to indicate a messianic significance to the term ἄνθρωπος.⁶

Horbury attempts to support the affirmation that the use of ἄνθρωπος in LXX Numbers 24 is messianic by referring to LXX Isa 19:20. In this latter verse, we find a prophecy about the forthcoming liberation of Egyptian Jews, in which the Lord promises to send them a saviour. While the MT version of the text reads מושיע ורב והצילם (“a saviour, and he shall contend and deliver them”), the LXX has ἄνθρωπον ὃς σώσει αὐτούς κρίνων σώσει αὐτούς (“a man who will save them; judging he will save them”). Horbury argues that the use of ἄνθρωπος in this verse indicates that, for the translator, “the ‘saviour’ of Egyptian Jews is evidently identified with the star-man of Balaam’s prophecy”.⁷

However, in the light of the explicative tendencies of the Isaiah translator, the use of ἄνθρωπος in 19:20 could very well simply be an explanatory rendering of מושיע without any special messianic significance attached to ἄνθρωπον. It is likely that ἄνθρωπος in LXX Num 24:17 is also an explanatory rendering, because in the same verse the metaphor פאתי מואב (“the brows of

⁴ G. Dorival, *La Bible d’Alexandrie: Les Nombres* (Paris: Cerf, 1994), 139-140, argues that this rendering is “more messianic” than the MT or the Targum, suggesting that the messianic conception of LXX Numbers is close to that of early Christianity. However, it could have originated in a reading of מדליו זלמים, with the first word understood as a form of the verb זלם and זלמים read by זלם, as acknowledged by W. Horbury, “Monarchy and Messianism in the Greek Pentateuch,” in *The Septuagint and Messianism*, ed. M. A. Knibb, BETL 195 (Leuven: Peeters, 2006), 121. Cf. A. Salvesen, *Symmachus in the Pentateuch*, JSS.M 15 (Manchester: University of Manchester), 1991, 134-135.

⁵ cf. LXX Isa 9:3[4]; Jer 48[31]:17; Ezek 19:11-12, 14; Ps 45[44]:7.

⁶ W. Horbury, *Jewish Messianism and the Cult of Christ* (London: SCM Press, 1998), 50.

⁷ Horbury, “Monarchy and Messianism”, 122. Cf. M. Rösel, “Jakob, Bileam und der Messias: messianische Erwartungen in Gen 49 und Num 22-24”, in *The Septuagint and Messianism*, ed. M. A. Knibb, BETL 195 (Leuven: Peeters, 2006), 169.

Moab”) is translated in an explanatory manner by τοὺς ἀρχηγοὺς Μωάβ (“the rulers of Moab”).⁸

The messianic interpretation of Num 24:7 and 17 is well attested in Early Judaism.⁹ Nevertheless, there is not enough linguistic evidence to explain the use of ἄνθρωπος in LXX Numbers 24:7 and 17 as messianic,¹⁰ and even less to support the claim that ἄνθρωπος was a messianic *terminus technicus* in the LXX.¹¹

It is very unlikely that we are dealing with a messianic term in LXX Isa 32:2 as well. Besides the paucity of evidence gathered from other texts, this can also be argued on linguistic grounds. ὁ ἄνθρωπος is normally the equivalent to the articular form הָאִישׁ, although sometimes it translates הָאָדָם (cf. Lev 6:3; Deut 8:3; Eccl 2:12; 3:11), and הַגִּבּוֹר (cf. Num 24:3, 15; Jer 17:7). אִישׁ is never translated with the articular form ὁ ἄνθρωπος, save, of course, in the case of construct chains such as אִישׁ הַיִּשְׂרָאֵלִי in Lev 24:10, אִישׁ הָאֱלֹהִים in 1 Sam 9:10, 1 Kgs 13:3, 6, 8, 11, 12, or אִישׁ שְׁלָמִי in Ps 41:10 (40:10).

Besides the straightforward meaning “the man”, the articular form ὁ ἄνθρωπος on its own seems to also mean “that man” in certain contexts, as indicated by the rendering of הָאִישׁ הַהוּא in 1 Sam 1:3. In this connection, the articular form appears in Gen 44:10 and Deut 24:12 as a good idiomatic equivalent to הוּא. In Lev 5:4 ὁ ἄνθρωπος is used in a general or universal manner as an equivalent to כָּל-אִשׁ, here, the meaning is basically “any man”.

In LXX Isaiah, ὁ ἄνθρωπος appears, besides 32:2, in 13:2, 14:16, and 22:25. In 14:16 it is a straight translation of הָאִישׁ. In 22:25 it is an explanatory translation of the metaphor הִתֵּר (“the peg”) – which incidentally weakens even further the case for a messianic interpretation of ἄνθρωπος in 19:20. 13:2 is a very

⁸ J. A. Fitzmyer, *The One Who is to Come* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007), 71.

⁹ For the messianic interpretation of Num 24:17 in early Judaism, cf. K. J. Cathcart, “Numbers 24:17 in Ancient Translations and Interpretations”, in *Interpretation of the Bible*, ed. J. Krašovec, JSOTSup 289 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 511-519.

¹⁰ The only other passage that reflects 24:11 and also uses ἄνθρωπος is *T. Judah* 24:1-6, but it was probably influenced by the LXX, as argued by J. J. Collins, “Messianism and Exegetical Tradition: The Evidence of LXX Pentateuch,” in *The Septuagint and Messianism*, ed. M. A. Knibb, BETL 195 (Leuven: Peeters, 2006), 145-146.

¹¹ Cf. Collins, “Messianism and Exegetical Tradition”, 145-146. A very interesting analysis, but which also does not offer a definitive answer is that of J. Lust, “The Greek Version of Balaam's Third and Fourth Oracles. The ἄνθρωπος in Num 24:7 and 17. Messianism and Lexicography”, in *VIII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies. Paris 1992*, eds. L. J. Greenspoon and O. Munnich, SCS 41 (Atlanta: Scholars, 1995); repr. in J. Lust, *Messianism and the Septuagint: Collected Essays*, ed. K. Hauspie, BETHL 178 (Leuven: Peeters, 2004), 69-86.

significant occurrence, because in it ὁ ἄνθρωπος is an equivalent of the anarthrous form אָנוּשׁ, and it is clearly used to signify “any man”.

All of this suggests that in LXX Isa 32:2, ὁ ἄνθρωπος can be taken either as a free translation of the idiomatic אִישׁ, meaning “any man”, or “each man”, or as a specification of the previous verse, in which case ὁ ἄνθρωπος is a reference to the royal figure, the king that is to come. In neither of these options, however, the expression itself functions as a specifically messianic term.

At any rate, the scale is heavily tilted in the direction of the first option, especially when we consider the free rendering of כְּמַחְבֵּה־רוּחַ by κρύπτων τοὺς λόγους αὐτοῦ. The *hapax legomenon* מַחְבֵּה is most likely understood as a participial form of הִבֵּה.¹² The rendering of the Hebrew, which can be taken literally, in this perspective, as “like one hiding a breath, or spirit” with the use of the accusative plural τοὺς λόγους αὐτοῦ in “the man shall be hiding his words” can be seen as a loose translation of רוּחַ. This is the only time the two terms are connected in the LXX. The word λόγος appears 44 times in LXX Isaiah, normally rendering דְּבַר, with only a few exceptions. It is added without a Hebrew equivalent in 10:22, 23, 30:12, and 36:14. It renders תּוֹרָה in 1:10 (according to S), and אִמְרָה in 28:23, 32:9, and 41:26. Significantly, it translates שִׁבֵּט in 11:4.¹³ In this case, the translator interprets the sceptre of the messianic figure metaphorically, and understands that it represents the judgment dispensed by the messiah upon his enemies.

Ziegler points to the targumic tradition to render רוּחַ with a form of מִימְרָא or מִלָּא (4:4; 25:4; 28:6; 30:28; 59:19; 63:14 and others), highlighting that sometimes the Targum uses the expression “the words of the prophets” (11:15; 61:1; 63:10).¹⁴ Given the openness of the translation to employ λόγος express a metaphorical sense, and the Targumic tradition to translate רוּחַ with different equivalents for “word”, we can conceive of λόγος as a plausible linguistic equivalent to רוּחַ in LXX Isa 32:2. One is still left with the task of making sense of the construction as it stands in the LXX. In this connection, it is interesting to note that in LXX Ps 119(118):11 we find the sentence ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ μου ἔκρυψα τὰ λόγια σου, ὅπως ἂν μὴ ἀμάρτω σοι.¹⁵ In Sir 1:24 it is said that the patient wise man ἕως καιροῦ κρύψει τοὺς λόγους αὐτοῦ, καὶ χεῖλη πολλῶν ἐκδιηγῆσεται σύνεσιν αὐτοῦ (“will hide his words until the [proper] time; than

¹² There would not be much difference if the *Vorlage* read כְּמַחְבֵּה like 1QIsa^a. In this case, the translator would have understood מַחְבֵּה as a participial form of חָבַה.

¹³ In that context, it translates the metaphorical פִּי בְשִׁבֵּט פִּי with τῷ λόγῳ τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ.

¹⁴ J. Ziegler, *Untersuchungen zur Septuaginta des Buches Isaias*, Alttestamentliche Abhandlungen 12-13 (Münster: Aschendorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1934), 84.

¹⁵ This is a translation of בְּלִבִּי צִפְנֹתִי אִמְרֹתַי לְמַעַן לֹא אַחֲטָא־לָךְ.

the lips of many will tell of his understanding”). These are examples of Hellenistic Jewish texts in which “hiding one’s words” was a sign of wisdom and piety. It is conceivable that the translator was familiarized with this notion.

It is significant that in Isa 29:14 אַבְדָּה חִכְמָת חִכְמָיו וּבִינָת נִבְנִיו תִּסְתָּתֵר is translated as καὶ ἀπολῶ τὴν σοφίαν τῶν σοφῶν καὶ τὴν σύνεσιν τῶν συνετῶν κρύψω. Both in Hebrew and in Greek the “wisdom of the wise will be concealed”. However, whereas in Hebrew the expression has a decidedly negative connotation, in Greek it can be interpreted in either positive or negative ways. That is, we can conceive the idea of “hiding the wisdom of the wise” as a judgement or as an announcement of protection and favour to the wise. This positive connotation appears, for instance, in Isa 49:2, where the Servant of the Lord affirms that the Lord “has hidden me under the shadow of his hand” (ὕπὸ τὴν σκέπην τῆς χειρὸς αὐτοῦ ἔκρυψέν με).

The Flood Imagery

LXX Isa 32:2 is cast in futuristic terms, with καὶ κρυβήσεται, which indicates that the translator understood וסתר as a *w^qatal* form of the verb סתר, with the passive voice employed in the translation due to semantic considerations, taking into account the notion of being protected from a storm or a strong movement of water. זרם is either bypassed or idiomatically subsumed together with מים later in the verse in the clause ὡς ἀφ’ ὕδατος.¹⁶ The whole sequence ὡς ἀφ’ ὕδατος φερομένου loosely renders כַּפְלִיגִימִים. The rare occurrences of פלג and its various translations in the LXX suggest that it was not treated as a technical or stereotyped term. Only the semantic thrust of the sequence is taken into account.

It is quite obvious that ἐν Σιῶν is a reading of the consonantal form of בצִיִּון. The occurrences of צִיִּון in the near context (28:16, 29:8, 30:19; 31:4, 9; 33:5, 14, 20, 34:8, 35:10, 37:22, 32) and the heavy ideological load of the term

¹⁶ Wildberger, *Isaiah 28-39*, 237, entertains the possibility that the LXX ὡς ἀφ’ ὕδατος – as well as the Vulgate’s *a tempestate* – seems to presuppose a form of מֶן before זרם (“tempest”). The reading וסתרם (with a third person plural possessive “their shelter”) in 1QIsa^a is adduced in support of this view. It could be the case that the original Hebrew did contain a form of מֶן that was subsequently lost in MT and absorbed by the preceeding word in 1QIsa^a. Yet, it is more likely that the form in 1QIsa^a is a mistake caused by haplography, as both Greek and Latin would require a preposition to express the meaning of the Hebrew properly, even without מֶן in the original. Another interesting translation of זרם is found in 25:5, as ἀνθρώπων πονηρῶν.

played a significant part in the form that the translation of the passage eventually took. καὶ φανήσεται does not have a discernible Hebrew counterpart, so it is likely to be an explanatory addition.¹⁷

It is also difficult to establish a close equivalence between ὡς ποταμὸς φερόμενος ἔνδοξος and כצל סלע־כבר. ὡς suggests the reading כצל, like the MT – in contrast with 1QIsa^a, which has בצל – and ἔνδοξος reflects כבר, but the other words do not seem to be translated on the basis of a one-to-one correspondence. It is important to note that the translation does not give indications elsewhere of a difficulty with the meaning of either צל or סלע, so that the deviating rendering of 32:2 must be seen as a deliberate departure from the plain sense of the specific terms, focusing on the sense of the verse as a whole.¹⁸ The rendering of עיפה by διψώση also steers the translation in the direction of the reference to water.

But the question is whether the Greek as it stands makes sense in the mind of the translation, and if so, how. There are two basic options. First, κρυβήσεται has “the man” as its passive subject. It is the pious that shall be hidden “as if carried by water”. In this case, φανήσεται has the Lord as an occult subject. It is he that will be manifest as a glorious river flowing in a parched land. This would make sense in the light of the overall context of 28-37 which speaks of divine judgement being poured down, as indicated above, and also of texts such as Isa 4:2-6, where the Lord “shines forth” (ἐπλάμψει) offering judgment and burning heat for the impenitent, protection and shade for the faithful.

Other parts of Isaiah also offer interesting insights. Isa 59:19 speaks of the wrath of the Lord coming like a mighty river (ὡς ποταμὸς βίαιος / צר כנהר צר). Isa 60:2 brings a promise to Jerusalem, that while darkness covers the world, “the Lord will appear upon you, and his glory will be seen upon you” with the LXX

¹⁷ Small explanatory additions such as this are an important feature of the translator’s technique. For the fullest survey of the additions and omissions in LXX Isaiah available, see M. van der Worm-Croughs, *The Old Greek of Isaiah: an Analysis of its Pluses and Minuses*, SBL.SCS 61 (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2014).

¹⁸ צל is rendered by σκιάν in Isa 4:6, 38:8, 51:16, and by σκέπην in the loose rendering of 16:3, 25:4, and 49:2 (49:2 and 51:16 have very similar contexts). The word is bypassed in 25:5. It is rendered idiomatically in the parallel occurrences at 30:2 and 30:3. In the first case, ויהחסות בצל מצרים is translated with καὶ σκεπασθῆναι ὑπὸ αἰγυπτίων, and in 30:3, we have καὶ τοῖς πεποιθόσιν ἐπ’ αἰγυπτον for ויהחסות בצל מצרים. In the free and loose rendering of 34:15, צל seems to be reflected in ἀσφαλείας. All these occurrences indicate that the translator was at home with the referential sense of the term, as well as with its possible metaphorical connotations. סלע is elsewhere in LXX Isaiah invariably rendered by πέτρα (cf. 2:21, 7:19, 22:16, 31:9, 33:16, 42:11, 57:5, and especially 16:1, where the place name is also translated with the simple Greek term).

rendering יורה by φανήσεται. And in Isa 66:12, were the Lord promises to Jerusalem that he will נטה־אליה כנהר שלום (“stretch over her peace like a river”), the LXX reads ἐγὼ ἐκκλίνω εἰς αὐτοὺς ὡς ποταμὸς εἰρήνης (“I will turn toward them like a river of peace”).

There is another possibility. The syntax also allows for “the man” to be the subject of φανήσεται. In this case, it is “the man” who will be manifest as a glorious river flowing in a parched land. Could such an interpretation be acceptable to the translator? The question is pertinent, because one would expect such a glorious manifestation to refer to the Lord.

Yet, it is possible to see the plausibility of this interpretation in the light of other examples in Isaiah and other texts. In Isa 48:18, the Lord affirms that if the people had been obedient their peace should be like a river (ἂν ὥσει ποταμὸς ἡ εἰρήνη σου).¹⁹ More significant is the eschatological affirmation, in Dan 12:3, that the “wise will shine like the shining of the firmament” (והמשכלים והמשיגים / יזהרו כזהר הרקיע / οἱ συνιέντες φανοῦσιν ὡς φωστῆρες τοῦ οὐρανοῦ). We are also reminded that, according to Prov 18:4 “Deep waters are the words in the mouth of a man, and the fountain of wisdom, a flowing stream”.²⁰ In Sir 24:30, the wise man can affirm: καὶ ὡς διῶρυξ ἀπὸ ποταμοῦ καὶ ὡς ὑδραγωγὸς ἐξῆλθον εἰς παράδεισον (“and I was like a canal from a river, like a water channel into a garden”). Also, Sir 47:14 says of the young king Solomon: ἐνεπλήσθης ὡς ποταμὸς συνέσεως (“You overflowed like a river of understanding”).

We see, therefore, that men endowed with wisdom and notorious for their obedience to God could be described both in terms of a glorious, shining manifestation (φανώω) and with the imagery of a mighty river. So that while it is hard to have a precise explanation of the latter part of LXX Isa 32:2, the overall context of Isaiah 28-32, and indeed of all of Isaiah, makes it perfectly plausible that the translator understood it as an amalgam of traditions and ideas relating to God’s visitation of Zion and the practice of Law and wisdom by his people.

Thus the rendering of this verse in LXX Isaiah is shaped by the close context of the passage and the broader context of Isaiah as a whole, read in the light of interpretative traditions and ideological influences proper to the translator’s milieu.

¹⁹ Rendering ויהי כנהר שלום. Also, Isa LXX 43:2 speaks of the Lord offering protection to the faithful so from rivers and fire (καὶ ἐὰν διαβαίνης δι’ ὕδατος, μετὰ σοῦ εἰμι, καὶ ποταμοὶ οὐ συγκαλύσουσίν σε· καὶ ἐὰν διέλθῃς διὰ πυρός, οὐ μὴ κατακαύσῃς, φλόξ οὐ κατακαύσει σε).

²⁰ The MT reads מים עמקים דברי פי־איש נהל נבע מקום חכמה, and the LXX has ὕδωρ βαθὺ λόγος ἐν καρδίᾳ ἀνδρός, ποταμὸς δὲ ἀναπηδύει καὶ πηγὴ ζώης.

No Longer Trusting in Men

The second half of 32:3 can also be taken as a free idiomatic rendering that follows the Hebrew somewhat closely and does not need comment. The question is how the first half, ולא תשעני עיני ראים, came to be rendered as καὶ οὐκέτι ἔσσονται πεποιθότες ἐπ' ἀνθρώποις. Ottley looks for an essentially “morphological” explanation connecting this reading with 31:1, where he argues that πεποιθότες is a misreading of שנה, with שען, “stay”, “lean upon”, which appears earlier in the verse.²¹ He believes that this confusion is carried over to 32:3, in the rendering of תשענינה, from שעע, which would also have been understood as a form of שען.²² He also tries to explain the change as a reading of אל אדם or על עיני ראים for אנשים.²³ It is possible that Ottley is correct in pointing to formal elements in the text that prompted the deviation, but ultimately the change is to be attributed to the carrying over of the idea of trusting in foreign powers found throughout Isaiah 28-31, a point to which we will return later.

Learning to Speak Peace

The first three lines of 32:4 are translated quite freely. The most significant deviation is the rendering of לדבר צחות by λαλεῖν εἰρήνην. The meaning and etymology of Hebrew צחות is obscure, and it is conceivable that the word is an addition in the MT.²⁴ At any rate, Seeligmann is correct in affirming that the explanation for the LXX reading is to be sought “in a reminiscence of the Septuagint of the Psalms”. He is thinking particularly of the occurrences of variant forms of λαλεῖν εἰρήνην in 27(28):3; 84(85):9 and 121(122):8.²⁵ The use of the phrase in these contexts points in the direction of a common idiom relating to a peaceful and righteous discourse and behaviour.

The same final line of 32:4 is inserted almost verbatim at the end of LXX Isaiah 29:24:

²¹ R. R. Ottley, *The Book of Isaiah according to the Septuagint (Codex Alexandrinus)* (2vols.; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1906), 2: 260. See also the notes on תשענינה in Wildberger, *Isaiah* 28-39, 231.

²² Ottley, *Isaiah*, 2: 264.

²³ Ottley, *Isaiah*, 2: 264. He also notes that τὸν ἀσθενούντων has the same root as “be quick” later in the verse, is rendered in 35:4 by ὀλιγόψυχοι.

²⁴ See Wildberger, *Isaiah* 28-39, 232.

²⁵ I. L. Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah: a Discussion of its Problems* (Leiden: Brill, 1948), 71. He also points to the “slightly different” λαλεῖν εἰρηνικά in LXX Jer 9:7.

Isa 29:24

MT

וַיֵּדְעוּ תַעֲרִירָהּ בִּינָה

וְרוֹגְגִים יִלְמְדוּ לִקְחָהּ

Those who err in spirit will know understanding

And those who murmur will receive instruction

LXX

καὶ γνώσονται οἱ τῷ πνεύματι
πλανώμενοι σύνεσιν

οἱ δὲ γογγύζοντες μαθήσονται
ὑπακούειν

καὶ αἱ γλώσσαι αἱ ψελλίζουσαι
μαθήσονται λαλεῖν εἰρήνην.

Those who are deceived in spirit will understand

And those who murmur will learn to obey
*And the tongue of the ones who falter in
speech
shall learn to speak peace*

In Isa 29:20-24 we have a reproach on oppression, in which the Greek version replaces the עריר ("tyrant") with the ἄνομος ("lawless") and the לץ ("scoffer") becomes the ὑπερήφανος ("arrogant"). Both figures are well known enemies in LXX Isaiah, and can be ideologically identified with those who represented the corruption of Jewish values and behaviour due to Hellenistic influences, or who in one way or another represented oppression for Alexandrian Jews. More significantly, while in the Hebrew the charge brought against them is that they pervert the practice of justice and the righteous functioning of the legal system, in the LXX of verse 21, they are accused of ποιοῦντες ἁμαρτεῖν ἀνθρώπους ἐν λόγῳ ("causing men to sin by [their] discourse").²⁶ In this context, at the end of the passage (vv. 23-24) we read that when the children of Jacob see the works of the Lord (which is itself a deviating rendering), they will sanctify the Lord and his name. In v. 24 the somewhat literal translation of וַיֵּדְעוּ תַעֲרִירָהּ בִּינָה וְרוֹגְגִים יִלְמְדוּ לִקְחָהּ ("And those who err in spirit will understand knowledge, and those who murmur will take instruction") by καὶ γνώσονται οἱ τῷ πνεύματι πλανώμενοι σύνεσιν, οἱ δὲ γογγύζοντες μαθήσονται ὑπακούειν ("And they that erred in spirit shall know understanding, and they that murmur shall learn obedience") receives the unsupported addition of καὶ αἱ γλώσσαι αἱ ψελλίζουσαι

²⁶ 30:9-12 presents an accusation against those who do not submit to the "Law of the Lord". The accusation is that the people preferred to ignore the Law, visions and prophetic announcements, and this rejection of divine instruction is tantamount to a rejection of the "Holy One of Israel" (v. 11). In the light of 32:2, one's attention is drawn to the translation, in 30:12, of עַן מֵאַסַּכְם בְּדַבָּר הַזֶּה ("Because you rejected this word") by ὅτι ἡπειθήσατε τοῖς λόγοις τούτοις ("Because you were disobedient to these words").

μαθήσονται λαλεῖν εἰρήνην. The almost exact same phrase (with the exception of ταχὺ) found in the end of 32:4.

The addition clearly indicates the connectedness of the two passages in the mind of the translator, and reinforces the idea that he sees 32:1-4 in the context of the vindication of the people of the Lord in Zion, against those who are disobedient and ungodly in their midst, and who manifest their disobedience chiefly by lack of conformity to the law and by leading others to error by their perverse influence in speech and conduct.

The Influence of the Literary Context

The influence of the immediate literary context in the translation is evidenced by the use of ἰδοὺ γὰρ at the opening of 32:1-4. In the LXX, the expression is almost entirely limited to Isaiah.²⁷ Of 27 occurrences of הָ in LXX Isaiah, this is the only instance where it is rendered by ἰδοὺ γὰρ.²⁸ The Greek phrase is a literal translation of כִּי־הִנֵּה in 26:21 and 66:15, and is inserted with no equivalent in 44:22.²⁹ ἰδοὺ γὰρ also appears as an equivalent to הִנֵּה in 10:33, 13:9, 62:11.³⁰

So ἰδοὺ γὰρ can be taken as a preferred expression of the translator, which serves both to introduce an oracle and connect it with a previous section. The lofty style of the phrase indicates an intention to use language appropriate to express the divine voice. ἰδοὺ γὰρ is variously used in Jewish texts originally composed in Greek (cf. Job 2:9 [an addition not without equivalent in the Hebrew text]; Jdt 5:23; 9:7; 12:12; 1 Macc 9:45; Odes 9:48; Luke 1:44; 1:48; 2:10; 6:23; 17:21; Acts 9:11; 2 Cor 7:11; 1 Clem 18:5, 6). In all of these cases,

²⁷ Elsewhere in the LXX, ἰδοὺ γὰρ renders הִנֵּה in 2 Sam 17:9; Ps 54:6(53:6) and הִנֵּה־הִנֵּה in Job 33:2. It is only used with הָ in Ps 51:7,8 (50:7,8).

²⁸ The other uses of הָ in LXX Isaiah.

²⁹ Elsewhere in LXX Isaiah, כִּי־הִנֵּה is rendered by ἰδοὺ δὲ in 3:1, and simply by ἰδοὺ in 60:2. In the Hebrew Bible, the construction כִּי־הִנֵּה appears mostly in poetic or oracular contexts and it invariably denotes logical or semantic connection between parts. This is clearly indicated by its renderings in the LXX. In the Psalms and Song of Solomon it is always rendered by ὅτι ἰδοὺ (Ps 11:2[10:2], 48:5[47:5], 59:4[58:4], 73:27[72:27], 83:3[82:3]; 92:10[91:10]; Song 2:11).²⁹ The same Greek phrase is used in Jer 30:3(37:3), 50:9 (27:9), and Ezek 30:9. The simple ὅτι appears in Jer. 25:29(32:29), Jer 34:7(41:7). In the Book of the Twelve, apart from the use of διὰ τοῦτο ἰδοὺ in Hos 9:6, and διότι in Zech 3:9, כִּי־הִנֵּה is rendered with διότι ἰδοὺ (Joel 4:1, Amos 4:2, 13, 6:11, 9:9, Mic 1:13, Zech 11:6, Mal 3:19). It is altogether omitted only in Jer 49:15(30:9), but this is a free rendering in which a reminiscence is given a futuristic connotation. The only occurrence of כִּי־הִנֵּה in a narrative is in 1 Sam 27:8, where it serves a simple connective function and it is rendered quite literally by καὶ ἰδοὺ.

³⁰ In this case, the LXX could lend weight to the reading found in 1QIsa^a.

together with the basic function of semantic linkage, the intention seems to be imitating some kind of heightened religious, scriptural, or divine diction.

ἰδοὺ γὰρ connects the oracle in 32:1-4 immediately with 31:9, which closes chapter 31. Isa 31:7-9 is a short oracle against Assyria which announces that its destruction is the result of divine action alone, and serves to complement the previous woe oracle (v. 1-6) against those who sought succour in Egypt. The Hebrew of this verse is a taunt against the Assyrian king, and reads וסלעו ממגור יעבור וחתו מנס שריו נאם־יהוה אשׁר־אור לו בציון ותנור לו בירושלם (“And his rock shall pass away, from fear, and his princes be frightened from the standard, says the Lord, who has his torch in Zion, and his furnace in Jerusalem”), translated in the LXX as πέτρα γὰρ περιλημφθήσονται ὡς χάρακι καὶ ἡττηθήσονται, ὁ δὲ φεύγων ἀλώσεται. Τάδε λέγει κύριος Μακάριος ὃς ἔχει ἐν Σίῳν σπέρμα καὶ οἰκεῖους ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ (“For they shall be encompassed by a rock, as with a palisade, and shall be vanquished, and he that flees shall be taken. Thus says the Lord, happy is he who has a seed in Zion, and kinsmen in Jerusalem”). This rendering displays a remarkably nationalistic connotation. Of special importance is the second half of the verse, produced by understanding נאם־יהוה as the introduction of a new divine speech, after which follows a misreading of אשׁר as אשׁרי (“blessed”, “happy”), resulting in the Greek μακάριος.³¹

This verse is significant because it offers some context to the translation of 32:1-4, which the translator sees the continuation of the previous running announcement of divine vengeance against those who trusted in Egypt and divine protection for Jerusalem that structures chapter 31.

It appears that the translator took into account the entire section that goes from chapters 28-32 in the Hebrew Book of Isaiah, when working on chapter 32. Regardless of how one conceives their compositional history, these chapters form a coherent whole dealing with the issue of political relations between Judah, Egypt and Assyria.³² The translator seems to have been mindful of the overall content of the section, naturally, under the light and influence of his own historical context and interpretative milieu. In this case, the address of a specific socio-political situation in the days of the prophet, namely, the threat

³¹ There is no way of determining how σπέρμα derives from אור or οἰκεῖους from תנור.

³² For an overview of the section in the Hebrew version of the book, see W. A. M. Beuken, “Women and the Spirit, the Ox and the Ass: The First Binders of the Booklet Isaiah 28-32,” ETL 74 (1998), 5-26; R. G. Kratz, “Rewriting Isaiah: the Case of Isaiah 28-31,” in *Prophecy and Prophets in Ancient Israel: Proceedings of the Oxford Old Testament Seminar*, ed. J. Day (New York / London: T & T Clark, 2010). G. Stansell, “Isaiah 28-33: blest be the tie that binds (Isaiah together)”, in *New visions of Isaiah* (Sheffield, Eng: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996).

of war with Assyria and the condemnation of the leaders who sought the support of Egypt is reread as a description of a future manifestation of God in which he will purify Zion, punishing those who are guilty of teaching error and distorting the knowledge of the Law (possibly by the propagation of Hellenistic influences), and vindicating those who remain faithful to their Jewish identity. This is a clear feature of other passages in LXX Isaiah (for instance, 8:12-16). It seems clear that this ideological reading prompted the specific deviations seen in 32:1-4.

A general overview of the content of Isaiah 28-31 helps us to see the ideological significance of the passage for the translator. The structural flow these chapters can be described as follows: 28:1-4 contains the judgment oracle against the “crown of te drunkards” of Ephraim; 28:7-13 is a second judgment oracle, condemning the “Covenant with Death” celebrated by Judean leaders; 28:14-22 is the celebrated announcement about the “cornerstone” in Zion; 28:23-29 is a short wisdom text, with an allegorical lesson taken from the world of farming; 29:1-8 presents the mysterious oracle against “Ariel”; 29:15-24 centres around the image of a Sealed Book and the theme of blindness and the need for divine illumination; 29:15-24 is a salvation oracle, with an announcement of renewal for the “offspring of Jacob”; 30:1-5 contains an oracle of judgment reproaching those who sought an alliance with Egypt. 30:6-7 comprise the vision of the animals of the Negev. 30:8-14 has the explanation of the oracle and a rebuke on those who are disobedient to oracles and words from the Lord. 30:15-26 consists in an oracle of salvation and future restoration pending repentance, which involves the casting out of idols, and subsequent affluence and blessing in the land, culminating in an outpouring of divine light. 30:27 initiates another oracle announcing the coming of the Lord in fiery judgement. 30:31-33 contains a threat against the Assyrian king.

31:1-3 starts another rebuke against those who trust in Egypt instead of listening to the divine words. 31:4-5 has an announcement (using animal imagery) of the return of the Lord to fight upon mount Zion. This is immediately followed by a summons, in 31:6-7 to obedience and renouncement of idolatry. 31:8-9 closes with a taunt against Assyria.

Elements in the passage seem to have a bearing on the peculiar shape of 32:1-4. I highlight especially those that describe the manifestation of divine wrath against the rebellious and impenitent by means of an upheaval of the natural world, expressed in terms of fire and flooding. The most important thing to note at this point is that, just as it is the case with 32:1-4, also in this larger section, one will look in vain for a precise correspondence between the

Hebrew terms describing these phenomena and their Greek translational counterparts. What we have, in fact, is a free rendering of the entire section with the cosmic or natural elements translated loosely or idiomatically.

It is instructive to consider some examples. In 30:27b, the metaphorical *his lips are full of indignation, and his tongue is like devouring fire*) is given an explanatory translation as τὸ λόγιον ὀργῆς πλῆρες, καὶ ἡ ὀργὴ τοῦ θυμοῦ ὡς πῦρ ἔδεται (“with glory the oracle of his lips, his oracle is full of wrath, and the wrath of his anger shall devour like fire”). The awesome judgement word of the Lord, presented in the Hebrew of v. 28 with וְרוּחוֹ כְּנַחַל שׁוֹטֵף עַד-צוּאֵר יִחַצֵּא (“And his breath is an overflowing stream, dividing even to the neck”) is understood as καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτοῦ ὡς ὕδωρ ἐν φάραγγι σῦρον ἥξει ἕως τοῦ τραχήλου (“And his breath, like water sweeping in a torrent-bed, shall come even to the neck”). 30:30 reads וְהַשְׁמִיעַ יְהוָה אֶת-הוֹרֵר קוֹלוֹ וְנָחַת זְרָעוֹ יֵרָאֶה בְּזַעַף אֵף וְלֹהֵב אֵשׁ אוֹכֵלָה נֶפֶץ זֶרֶם וְאֵבָן בְּרִדָּד (“And the Lord shall cause the majesty of his voice to be heard, and the lighting down of his arm to be seen, with fury of anger, and the flame of devouring fire; scattering, rain-storm, and hailstone”). This is rendered by καὶ ἀκουστήν ποιήσει ὁ θεὸς τὴν δόξαν τῆς φωνῆς αὐτοῦ καὶ τὸν θυμὸν τοῦ βραχίονος αὐτοῦ δείξει μετὰ θυμοῦ καὶ ὀργῆς καὶ φλογὸς κατεσθιούσης· κεραυνώσει βιαίως καὶ ὡς ὕδωρ καὶ χάλαζα συγκαταφερομένη βίᾳ (“And God shall make the glory of his voice heard, even to show the wrath of his arm with wrath and anger and devouring flame, he shall thunder violently (upon them), and like water and hail descending with violence”).

Summary and Conclusions

We can summarize our study of LXX Isa 32:1-4 as follows: In comparison with the Hebrew version of the oracle, the Greek presents a change of focus from the hope of righteous rule by a king to the person of a righteous king himself. The subsequent changes in the section, such as the use of the articular form ὁ ἄνθρωπος, the translation of the flood imagery and the particular treatment of references to conduct and speech, indicate that the translator rendered the text in the light of certain interpretative traditions and ideological trends characteristic of his own Hellenistic Jewish milieu. The text also gives evidence that the immediate and larger literary contexts of the Book of Isaiah were taken into consideration.

This study serves as a contribution to an ongoing debate in the field of LXX Isaiah, namely, the proper understanding of what “actualizing” interpretation means. It is well known that two diametrically opposing views have become

standard. On the one hand, the approach of authors such as Arie van der Kooij, who sees a high degree of theological and ideological transformation and an effective attempt to recreate independent oracles in Greek.³³ On the other, the view championed by authors such as Ronald Troxel and J. Ross Wagner, who eschew the idea of actualizing interpretation altogether.³⁴

The translation of LXX Isa 32:1-4 is a good example of how different linguistic, literary, historical, and ideological factors influenced the activity of the translator and the way he read the Isaiah oracles. By recasting the hopes expressed in the text within his own Hellenistic milieu, the translator changes the meaning of the original oracle. Yet, the evidence is not sufficient to indicate a conscious program of theological transformation or actualization of prophecy. The ideological transformation of the Isaianic hope is, paradoxically, the result of an attempt to communicate the “original” meaning of the text, as the translator sees it.

RODRIGO FRANKLIN DE SOUSA

Faculté Jean Calvin

Aix-en-Provence, France

rodrigoeana@hotmail.com

³³ A. van der Kooij, “Isaiah in the Septuagint,” in *Writing and Reading the Scroll of Isaiah: Studies of an Interpretive Tradition*, eds. C. C. Broyles and C. A. Evans, VTS 70/2 (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 513-529; A. van der Kooij, *The Oracle of Tyre: the Septuagint of Isaiah XXIII as Version and Vision*, VTS 71 (Leiden: Brill, 1998). More recently, this approach has been reflected in monographs such as W. d. A. Cunha, *LXX Isaiah 24:1-26:6 as Interpretation and Translation: A Methodological Discussion*, SBL.SCS 62 (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2014).

³⁴ R. L. Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah as Translation and Interpretation. The Strategies of the Translator of the Septuagint of Isaiah*, VTS 124 (Leiden: Brill, 2008); J. R. Wagner, *Reading the Sealed Book: Old Greek Isaiah and the Problem of Septuagint Hermeneutics* (Waco: Baylor University Press, 2013). For a full discussion of the latter book, see L. J. Greenspoon, et al., “Interpreting the Sealed Book,” *JSCS* 47 (2014), 1-31.

Jérôme dans le sillage d'Aquila et du Targoum: Vg iuxta Hebraeos Ps 42[41],2 et Vg 1 R 22,38

ANNE-FRANÇOISE LOISEAU

Dans son livre récent sur Jérôme, Christophe Rico¹ souligne la finesse interprétative et l'inégalable qualité du traducteur de la Vulgate, qui a, en outre, su faire place, à l'occasion, aux virtualités du texte biblique, par exemple en actualisant les interprétations potentielles de la *scriptio defectiva* du texte consonantique, dans une “perception de la Bible comme une unité essentielle où le Nouveau Testament accomplit l'Ancien, au-delà du sens littéral du verset traduit.” Cependant, ainsi qu'il le fait remarquer, “en règle générale, Jérôme cherche à retrouver dans sa traduction le sens exact donné au texte en son milieu d'origine...”²

Certes, je suis d'accord avec Chr. Rico, Jérôme est certainement capable du meilleur, mais aussi, me semble-t-il, du moins bon dès lors que l'on s'accorde sur le fait que la traduction doit tenter de transmettre le sens du texte source (tout en respectant autant que possible les exigences de la langue cible). En effet, quoiqu'il ait largement réfléchi sur le phénomène de traduction³, bien souvent, Jérôme suit, plutôt que son modèle en hébreu, la LXX ou les réviseurs grecs postérieurs (surtout Symmaque et Aquila), ou, à l'occasion, les traditions targoumiques, auxquelles il avait manifestement accès grâce à ses “maîtres hébreux”.

En effet, Jérôme ne s'en cache pas, même s'il ne le précise pas systématiquement: dans ses Commentaires de la Genèse ou des Prophètes, il montre bien qu'il travaille en s'appuyant fortement sur les Hexaples d'Origène et en opérant ce qu'il juge être le meilleur choix. Il explique d'ailleurs souvent ce choix lorsqu'il

¹ C. Rico, *Le traducteur de Bethléem. Le génie inventif de saint Jérôme à l'aune de la linguistique*, Lectio Divina 270 (Paris: Cerf, 2016).

² Rico, *Le traducteur de Bethléem*, 101.

³ Cf. par exemple dans sa Lettre 57 (Ad Pammachium): Saint Jérôme. *Lettres*, Volume III (traduction J. Labourt; Paris: Les Belles lettres, 1953), 59-61.

se décide à suivre l'un ou l'autre des réviseurs⁴. Sans doute a-t-il une préférence pour Symmaque, mais il privilégie souvent aussi Aquila⁵.

Prenons rapidement un exemple de chaque sorte, avant de détailler deux cas plus complexes.

Pour ce qui est de l'influence de la LXX, citons par exemple Ex 2,2, qui raconte la naissance de Moïse: "Celle-ci conçut et enfanta un fils. Voyant combien il était beau (טוב), elle le dissimula pendant trois mois."⁶ Plutôt que traduire טוב par ἀγαθός (Aquila) ou καλός (Symmaque), la LXX a utilisé l'adjectif plus recherché ἀστεῖος "urbain, courtois, raffiné, élégant, spirituel",⁷ ce que Jérôme a imité: videns eum *elegantem*, abscondit tribus mensibus.

Pour ce qui est de l'influence des réviseurs, mentionnons par exemple Ex 1,13: "Alors les Égyptiens asservirent les fils d'Israël *avec brutalité* (בְּכֹחַ)" (TOB). La LXX a correctement traduit בְּכֹחַ par βίᾳ "par la force, avec violence", tout comme le Tg: בְּקִשְׁיָא "avec dureté". En revanche, nous trouvons dans la Vg: et adfligebant *inludentes eis* "et ils les opprressaient *en se moquant d'eux*"⁸. Cette traduction s'inspire de Symmaque, dont Jérôme reprend même le participe (ἐντροφῶντες "se moquant"⁹); Théodotion a traduit l'expression dans le même sens: ἐμπαιγμῶ "par moquerie". La traduction d'Aquila n'est pas conservée. Toutefois, dans les autres livres où בְּכֹחַ apparaît, Jérôme semble avoir acquis la connaissance de la signification de l'expression, puisqu'il la traduit par "per potentiam" (Lv 25,43.46); "violenter" (Lv 25,53); et "cum potentia" (Ez 34,4).

⁴ J. Ziegler, *Sylogie. Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Septuaginta* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971), 142-148, a rassemblé divers passages des Commentaires des Prophètes, où Jérôme loue les traductions des réviseurs grecs, sous la rubrique "Lobende Anerkennung der Übersetzungsweise des Aquila, Symmachus und Theodotion".

⁵ Selon Ziegler, *Sylogie*, 139-228 (consacrées à "Die jüngere griechischen Übersetzungen als Vorlage der Vulgata"), c'est la traduction élégante de Symmaque qui a le plus influencé la Vg (159). Ainsi J. M. Dines, "Jerome and the Hexapla: The Witness of the Commentary on Amos", dans A. Salvesen, *Origen's Hexapla and Fragments*, Texte und Studien zum Antiken Judentum 58 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997), 421-436, a compté, pour le Commentaire d'Amos, huit utilisations explicites de Symmaque, cinq d'Aquila, et deux de Théodotion (432).

⁶ Sauf mention contraire, la traduction est généralement celle de la Bible de Jérusalem.

⁷ Comme le notent très justement Alain Le Boulluec et Pierre Sandevor dans la Bible d'Alexandrie 2, p. 80 : «Appliqué à un enfant, l'adjectif asteios signifie «gracieux, charmant»; de même pour une femme (ainsi Jdt 11, 23); le grec enjolive le récit [...]».

⁸ Au verset suivant, Jérôme semble n'avoir pas traduit l'expression.

⁹ Cf. A.-F. Loiseau, "Lorsque la philologie et la psychologie se rejoignent... Note sur l'utilisation du verbe ἐντροφάω, en particulier dans la Septante", *Semitica et Classica* 9 (2016), 205.

Pour ce qui est d'un exemple de coïncidence entre la Vg et le Tg, enfin, examinons Ex 1,19: “Les sages-femmes dirent au Pharaon: “Les femmes des Hébreux ne sont pas comme les Égyptiennes; elles sont *pleines de vie* (חַיִּים); avant que la sage-femme n'arrive auprès d'elles, elles ont accouché.” (TOB) Cet adjectif חַיִּים “pleines de vie, vigoureuses”, le Tg l'a traduit par חֲכִימָן “expertes, ayant du savoir-faire”. Jérôme ne s'est inspiré d'aucune des traductions grecques à sa disposition, que ce soit la LXX (τίκτουςιν “elles accouchent”), ou les réviseurs (Aquila: τοκάδες “elles sont en travail”; Symmaque: μαῖαι “elles sont sages-femmes”; Théodotion: ζωογονοῦσιν “elles mettent au monde (des enfants) vivants, elles préservent la vie”; Les autres: ὑγιαίνουσιν “elles sont en bonne santé”). Comme le Tg, Jérôme a privilégié les connaissances des femmes des Hébreux: ipsae enim *obstetricandi*¹⁰ *habent scientiam* “elles ont en effet la science de l'obstétrique”.

Après cette brève entrée en matière, cet article présente donc au lecteur deux cas plus complexes, l'un d'une traduction inspirée d'Aquila et l'autre, d'une traduction influencée vraisemblablement par la tradition targoumique.

1. Psaume 42[41],2: une traduction latine qui tente de réaliser un compromis entre Aquila et le bon sens, et qui, dès lors, s'écarte encore plus de son modèle en hébreu!

Dans sa traduction du Ps 42[41],2, nous verrons que Jérôme, sous l'influence d'Aquila, nous éloigne du texte hébreu, bien qu'il ait eu sous les yeux la traduction de la LXX, qui suit parfaitement le TM, y compris dans sa vocalisation.

1a. Aquila Ps 42[41],2.

Avant d'examiner la traduction d'Aquila de ce verset du Psaume 42, il nous faut d'abord observer un phénomène de traduction bien particulier concernant non seulement Aquila, mais aussi les autres réviseurs grecs, Jérôme et les Targoumim.

Dès la première mention du *chêne* de Morê (אֵלֶּן מוֹרֵה) en Gn 12,6, nous avons la traduction “*plaine/vallée*” en araméen dans le Tg Onqelos (מִישְׁרֵי מוֹרֵה) “*plaine de Morê*”), le Tg Neofiti (מִשְׁרֵיהַ חֲזוֹן) “*plaine de la vision*”), le

¹⁰ Je me suis permise de corriger l'édition de Weber, qui présente une erreur (*obsetricandi*).

Tg samaritain (מישר חובה) “*plaine de la vision*”) et dans la Vg (convallum Inlustrem “*vallée manifeste*”).¹¹ Certes, nous restons plus ou moins dans le domaine de la verdure (chêne/vallée), mais le sens diverge néanmoins.

Dans ses *Hebraicae Quaestiones in libro Geneseos*, Jérôme précise le lieu de naissance d'Isaac en ces termes: “... Notandum est [...] quod Isaac non sit natus ad quercum Mamre sive in aulone Mamre, ut in hebraeo habetur, sed in Geraris...” (“Il faut noter qu'Isaac n'est pas né au chêne de Mamre, ou plutôt dans la plaine de Mamre, comme c'est dit en hébreu, mais à Gêrar.”)¹² Par ailleurs, dans son traité sur les noms propres, il explique la signification du nom proche Aialon (אֵילֹן): campi vel aulones (des champs ou des vallées = αὐλώνες)¹³. Cette traduction du “chêne” par “plaine” semble donc avoir été traditionnelle, peut-être, ainsi que B. Grossfeld le suggère, pour éviter qu'Abraham ne soit associé de quelque manière que ce soit avec le culte idolâtre des arbres¹⁴. Rappelons-nous également qu'en Jg 9,35, il est question du “chêne des devins” (אֵילֹן מְשִׁינִים).

De même, en Dt 11,30, le substantif αὐλὼν “la vallée”¹⁵ a été choisi par Aquila, Symmaque et Théodotion pour traduire אֵילֹן “le chêne”, de sonorité proche, dans l'expression מִרְיָא אֵילֹנֵי מֹרֶה “les chênes de Morê”, qu'ils ont traduite par αὐλῶνος καταφανοῦς “la vallée visible”.

¹¹ Idem TM אֵילֹן - Tg מישר - Vg: (con)vallis: Tg et Vg Gn 13,18; 14,13; 18, 1; Jg 4,11, etc; à côté de traductions littérales en בשמא “térébinthe” ou בלוט “chêne” et quercus “chêne” en Tg et Vg Ez 27,6; Os 4,13; Am 2,9, etc. En revanche, le synonyme proche אֵלֶה “térébinthe” n'est jamais traduit par “plaine” dans le Tg et la Vg. Nous avons conservé la traduction de Symmaque Gn 12, 6, qui est conforme au TM: τῆς δρυὸς Μαμβρη.

¹² Hieronymus, *Hebraicae Quaestiones in libro Geneseos*, CCSL 72 (Turnhout: Brepol, 1959), 26.

¹³ Hieronymus, *Liber Interpretationis Hebraicorum nominum*, CCSL 72, Turnhout: Brepols (1959), 90.

¹⁴ B. Grossfeld, *The Targum Onkelos to Genesis*, The Aramaic Bible 6 (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1988), 63 n. 4: The Hebrew: “terebinth” is here interpretatively rendered “plain(s)” as it is in Tg. Ps.-Jon., Tg. Neof. and Vg (convallis illustris), as well as in the Midrash (cf. Gen. Rab. XL1:8, p. 414). The same interpretative translation exists in Tg. Neb. to Judg 9:6 and the Sam. Tg. to the present verse. This interpretation may have been designed to remove any suspicion from Abraham that he may have been associated with centers of tree worship -- in view of terebinths having been used for idolatrous adoration (cf. Encyclopaedia Biblica III, 2915, s.v. Mamre).” Cf. aussi M. Aberbach et B. Grossfeld, *Targum Onkelos to Genesis, A Critical Analysis Together with an English Translation of the Text* (New York: Ktav Publishing House, 1982), 79-80 n. 5: d'autres explications sont proposées encore, mais le culte des arbres est la plus convaincante.

¹⁵ Dans la LXX, ce substantif αὐλὼν traduit les équivalents מִרְיָא (ex. LXX 1 S 17,3) et עֵקֶב (ex. LXX 1 Ch 10,7).

On peut supposer que cette interprétation traditionnelle précédait les réviseurs grecs, pour la raison de respect pour Abraham mentionnée ci-dessus; en outre, la coïncidence sonore entre l'hébreu אֵלֶין et le grec αὐλών les a sans nul doute confortés dans l'usage de cette traduction.

Le complément “la vision” (חזיונה / חזובה) et l'adjectif “manifeste” (illustris) des Versions de Gn 12,6, tout comme l'adjectif “visible, manifeste” (καταφανής) des réviseurs grecs en Dt 11,30, proviennent bien évidemment de la racine ראה “voir”, proche de Morê. Pour ce qui est de Gn 12,6, il est question, en effet, au verset suivant de Dieu qui *a été vu* par Abraham (2 fois le verbe ראה). Cette traduction “étymologique” sera aussi utilisée pour rendre le nom proche Moriyyah de Gn 22,2, ce qui se comprenait certainement aussi dans ce récit bâti précisément autour du verbe ראה “voir” (cf. Gn 22,8 et 14)¹⁶: Aquila: adj. καταφανής “visible”; Symmaque: substantif ὀπτασία “la vision”; Tg samaritain¹⁷: חזיונה ; Vg: “visio”. De même, “la colline de Moré dans la plaine”, en Jg 7,1, a été traduite par גבעתה דמסתכיא למישרא “la colline *qui regarde* sur la plaine” dans le Tg Yonathan.

Notons que la LXX a, pour sa part, interprété Morê / Moriyyah d'après la racine רום en relation de métathèse avec מורה / מרה: le chêne de Morê en Gn 12,6 (ἐπὶ τὴν δρῦν τὴν ὑψηλὴν “au chêne *élevé*”) et Dt 11,30 (τῆς δρυὸς τῆς ὑψηλῆς); la terre de Moriyyah en Gn 22,2 (εἰς τὴν γῆν τὴν ὑψηλὴν). Peut-être est-ce l'indice que le traducteur grec de Gn, qui a initié cette traduction, pensait au mont du Temple (identifié comme le Moriyyah selon 2 Ch 3,1), qui “sera élevé” au-dessus des collines, comme nous le prédit Is 2,2 (LXX: ὑψωθήσεται)? De même, Ez 20,40; 34,14 et 40,2 soulignent que la montagne du Temple est une haute montagne. Dans le récit selon la LXX, cela permettrait par ailleurs de comprendre qu'Abraham l'ait aperçu de loin (Gn 2,4). De même, dans le sillage de la LXX, en Vg Jg 7,1, “la colline de Moré” (גבעת המורה) a été traduite par *collis Excelsi* “la colline *élevée*”.

Cette traduction traditionnelle homophone de אֵלֶין en αὐλών chez les réviseurs grecs nous permettra sans doute de comprendre la traduction d'Aquila du Ps 42[41],2. Examinons l'énoncé de ce verset:

¹⁶ Notons que Moriyyah a également été rapproché dans l'exégèse rabbinique des verbes ירה “enseigner” et ירא “craindre” (par exemple, en TB *Taanith* 16a), de אור “la lumière”; מרוחא (araméen) “la domination”; מור “la myrrhe” ou מור “échanger”; cf.. J. Levy, *Neuhebräisches und Chaldäisches Wörterbuch* (Leipzig: Brockhaus, 1876), s.v. מוריה. Jérôme avait manifestement accès à ces traditions, puisque, dans ses *Hebraicos quaestiones in libro Geneseos*, à propos de Gn 22, 2, CCSL 72, 26, il fait le lien entre le nom Moriyya, le mont du Temple, et les deux racines proches ירה “enseigner” et אור “être lumineux”.

¹⁷ Edition A. Brüll, *Das Samaritanische Targum zum Pentateuch* (Hildesheim - New York: G. Holms, 1971).

כְּאַיִל תַּעֲרַן עַל־אֶפְיִקְרָמִים כֵּן נַפְשִׁי תַּעֲרַן אֵלַיךְ אֱלֹהִים: TM:

“Comme un cerf/une biche languit auprès des torrents,
ainsi mon âme languit vers toi, mon Dieu.”

Le substantif *אַיִל* le cerf”, précédé de la particule de comparaison, ne présente aucune difficulté, sinon peut-être l'accord féminin du verbe, ce qui a poussé les critiques à émettre l'hypothèse d'une erreur par haplographie à partir de *כְּאַיִלָּת תַּעֲרַן* “comme la biche languit”; l'article féminin dans la LXX (*ἡ ἔλαφος*) pourrait corroborer cette suggestion, encore qu'il y ait en hébreu des animaux de forme masculine qui clairement désignent la femelle, puisque le verbe est au féminin (ex. *דִּבּ* “l'ourse” en 2 R 2,24). En outre, comme le signale également D. Barthélemy, le grec *ἡ ἔλαφος* lui-même est ambigu, puisqu'il peut être employé comme un générique pour les deux sexes¹⁸. Dès lors, conclut-il avec raison, le TM peut être conservé tel quel.

Le verbe *עֲרַן*, pour sa part, est rare, puisqu'il n'est attesté qu'au Ps 42,2 et en Jl 1,20, et dans un contexte assez similaire chez Joël: les bêtes des champs, en détresse à cause de la sécheresse causée par le feu du Jour de Yhwh, se tournent vers Dieu, tout comme le prophète lui-même (v. 19).

Selon les lexicographes (ex. HALOT), l'étymologie de cette racine *עֲרַן* est incertaine. Si l'on suit les traductions des LXX et du Tg, le verbe, construit avec les prépositions *עַל*/*אֶל*, signifierait “regarder vers le haut, avec espoir” (*ἀναβλέπω* - *כִּבֵּר* Jl 2,20), “désirer ardemment, languir” (*ἐπιποθέω* - *רָגַב* Ps 42 [41],2). Symmaque Ps 42[41], 2, de son côté, a traduit le verbe par *σπεύδω* “être anxieux, s'affoler, frémir”¹⁹. La Peshitta Ps 42,2 a traduit *עֲרַן* par *נִנְא* “beugler, mugir, crier, implorer”. Force nous est de déduire la signification approximative du verbe *עֲרַן* d'après ces traductions anciennes et de lui attribuer les valeurs de: “regarder avec espoir, avec désir, avec anxiété, de faire appel à”²⁰.

Le corpus biblique, par ailleurs, a conservé un *substantif* *עֲרוּגָה* “le parterre, le lopin cultivé”²¹, attesté deux fois dans le Cantique (Ct 5,13; 6,2) et deux fois

¹⁸ D. Barthélemy, *Critique textuelle de l'Ancien Testament. Psaumes*, OBO 50/4, (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2005), 245.

¹⁹ Pour l'élargissement du champ sémantique de *σπεύδω* dans la LXX, cf. A.-F. Loiseau, *L'influence de l'araméen sur les traducteurs de la Septante principalement*, SCS 65 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature Press, 2016), 69-70.

²⁰ Cf. La formulation proche de Ps 42[41],3: “Mon âme *a soif* (*צָמָאָה*) de Dieu, du Dieu vivant; quand irai-je et verrai-je la face de Dieu?” Notons la préposition ambiguë par respect de Dieu dans la LXX: *ἐδύψησεν ἡ ψυχὴ μου πρὸς τὸν θεὸν τὸν ζῶντα* “mon âme *a soif du* / *devant le Dieu vivant*”. Mais Ps 63[62],2: *ἐδύψησέν σοι ἡ ψυχὴ μου*.

²¹ Ce substantif a son équivalent arabe selon HALOT.

dans Ezéchiel (Ez 17,7.10). Le lien de parenté entre le substantif עֲרוֹנָה et le verbe עָרַן n'est absolument pas clair. Ce substantif a été traduit, par exemple, en Ez 17,7 par βῶλος “la motte de terre, le sol” (LXX); παρσιὰ “le parterre de poireaux” (Aquila) = *areola* “le parterre” (Vg); πρέμνον “la tige, la souche” (Symmaque); φιάλη “le large bol” (Théodotion)²²; עֲרוֹנָה “le sillon” (Tg)²³.

La traduction d'Aquila de ce substantif עֲרוֹנָה par παρσιὰ nous permet toutefois de comprendre sa traduction du verbe עָרַן en Ps 42[41],2: Aquila semble, en effet, avoir considéré que עֲרוֹנָה était un participe passif *qal* féminin de עָרַן et a dès lors développé un verbe à partir de παρσιὰ “le parterre”, à savoir παρσιάζω Pass. “être divisé en parterres”²⁴.

Les deux premiers mots du Ps 42, 2 תָּעִי לִי חֶמְדָּה ont donc été traduits par ὡς αὐλῶν πεπρασιασμένος “comme une plaine divisée en parterres”. Aquila a donc, d'une part, rendu חֶמְדָּה - qu'il lisait vraisemblablement avec la vocalisation חֶמְדָּה “le térébinthe” et qu'il considérait comme une variante de חֶמְדָּה²⁵ - par la traduction traditionnelle homophonique en grec (αὐλῶν) et d'autre part, il a offert une traduction “étymologique” de תָּעִי à partir de עָרַן, créant ainsi le néologisme παρσιάζω.²⁶ Cette traduction “étymologique” est continuée dans le deuxième stique: “ainsi mon âme *est divisée en parterres* vers toi”.(!)

La comparaison avec le cerf (ou avec le térébinthe) et une signification sensée ont donc été estompées au profit des “techniques” de traduction littérale par homophonie et étymologie. Ces deux procédés ont permis à Aquila de rester, à sa manière très particulière, le plus près possible du texte hébreu.

²² Théodotion reprend en fait la traduction de la LXX de עֲרוֹנָה en Ct 5, 13 et 6, 2: en effet, la LXX a traduit “une coupe de parfums aromatiques”, plutôt qu'un “parterre d'herbes aromatiques” (TM).

²³ Mais Tg Ct 5,13: גַּן “le jardin”.

²⁴ La Quinta présente également ce verbe παρσιάζω: ὁν τρόπον πεδίον πρασιασθῆ... “de la même façon qu'une plaine est partagée en parterres...” De même, la Syrohexaplaire s'est inspirée d'Aquila, puisqu'elle présente comme sujet le substantif פֶּתַח “la plaine” et la racine שָׁבַע *athpeel*, qui a ce même sens d'être divisé en parterres de culture.

²⁵ Notons, par ailleurs, que l'araméen חֶמְדָּה, fréquemment utilisé dans les Targoumim, signifie “la vallée”: ainsi, en 1 S 17,3, le TM חֶמְדָּה “la vallée” a été traduit ὁ αὐλῶν par la LXX et חֶמְדָּה par le Tg. La proximité matérielle entre חֶמְדָּה et חֶמְדָּה a peut-être aussi joué un rôle dans le choix d'Aquila.

²⁶ K. Hyvärinen, *Die Übersetzung von Aquila*, CBOT (Uppsala: Lund LiberLäromedel-Gleerup, 1977), 111, souligne, dans ses conclusions, l'extrême stabilité des équivalents entre le grec et l'hébreu chez Aquila, ainsi que le caractère “étymologique” de ses traductions, dans la mesure où les termes d'une même racine grecque traduisent les termes d'une même racine hébraïque (vraie ou supposée). Ce dernier constat avait déjà été établi par J. Reider, *Prolegomena to a Greek-Hebrew and Hebrew-Greek Index to Aquila* (Philadelphie: Oxford University Press, 1916), 20-22.

1b. Vg iuxta Hebraeos Ps 42[41],2

Examinons d'abord les deux traductions de la Vulgate pour le verbe עָרַב:

TM JI 1,20a: נִסְכְּחוּ שָׂדֵה תַּעְרוֹנִי אֵלַיךְ

“Même les bêtes des champs languissent après toi...”

Vg: sed et bestiae agri quasi area sitiens imbrem suspexerunt ad te...

“mais même les bêtes du champ, comme une parcelle assoiffée de pluie, levèrent leur regard²⁷ vers toi...”

Dans ce verset, Jérôme s'est inspirée de la traduction “étymologique” d'Aquila pour le verbe תַּעְרוֹנִי, et a donc développé de thème de la parcelle (*area*) correspondant au substantif עֲרוֹנָה²⁸, et l'a amplifié d'après le contexte de sécheresse du verset (“assoiffée de pluie”). Il a repris, par ailleurs, la traduction de la LXX pour תַּעְרוֹנִי: “regarder vers le haut, lever le regard”. Jérôme offre donc une double traduction du verbe תַּעְרוֹנִי: “lever le regard” (= LXX) et “être divisé en parcelles” (= Aquila).

Il ne cache pas s'être inspiré d'Aquila dans son Commentaire de Joël²⁹, où il aligne, comme à son habitude, la traduction latine de la LXX et sa propre traduction réalisée supposément d'après l'hébreu: “... bestiae et iumenta agri, sive campi, suspexerunt ad Dominum, quasi areola sitiens imbrem. Hoc enim uno verbo significat Aquila dicens ἐπρασιώθη; ” (“... les bêtes et les animaux du champ, ou de la plaine, ont regardé vers le Seigneur, comme un parterre assoiffé de pluie. Ceci, Aquila l'a exprimé d'un seul mot en disant ἐπρασιώθη.”)

TM Ps 42[41],2: כְּאֵיל תַּעְרֵנִי עַל־אֲפִיק־מַיִם כֵּן נַפְשִׁי תַּעְרֵנִי אֵלֶיךָ אֱלֹהִים:

“Comme languit une biche après les eaux vives, ainsi languit mon âme vers toi, mon Dieu.”

Vg iuxta Hebraeos: sicut areola praeparata ad inrigationes aquarum sic anima mea praeparata est ad te Deus.

“Comme *un parterre préparé* à l'irrigation des eaux, ainsi mon âme *est préparée* vers toi, mon Dieu.”

Rappelons la traduction d'Aquila pour le début du verset: ὥς αὐλῶν πεπρασιασμένος “comme une plaine divisée en parterres”. Tout comme chez

²⁷ La Vg a suivi la LXX pour ce sens de “lever le regard”; d'ailleurs, dans ses Commentaires sur Joël, Jérôme traduit le verbe grec par “suspexerunt”, qui coïncide donc avec sa traduction latine de la LXX.

²⁸ Le substantif latin *area* correspond au substantif hébreu עֲרוֹנָה, comme en Vg Ez 17,10.

²⁹ CCSL 76, 175.

Aquila, la comparaison avec le cerf/le térébinthe (אַיִל / אֵיל) a disparu de la Vulgate, mais elle n'a pas été remplacée par *vallis / convallis*, l'équivalent latin de אֵלֶּל "la plaine, la vallée". Au lieu d'offrir une traduction pour le premier substantif אֵיל "le cerf"³⁰/ אֵיל "le térébinthe"³¹, nous trouvons une traduction en *areola* "le parterre", que Jérôme réserve d'ordinaire au substantif עֲרוֹנָה (Vg Ct 5,13; 6,2; Ez 17,7). Il reprend donc, mais pour le premier mot et non le second, la traduction "étymologique" d'Aquila. Dès lors, en effet, que Jérôme suit Aquila pour la signification du verbe עָרַן, à savoir "être divisé en parcelles", il peut difficilement conserver le sujet "cerf".

Par ailleurs, Jérôme a traduit le verbe תַּעֲרַן dans les deux stiques par le latin "être préparé", sans doute influencé par le verbe fréquent עָרַךְ "préparer, disposer", de consonance proche³². Le participe passif féminin עֲרוּכָה ressemble fort, en effet, à עֲרוֹנָה. La traduction de la Vulgate évoque donc un énoncé en hébreu: כַּעֲרוֹנָה עֲרוּכָה "comme un parterre préparé..."³³, ou peut-être, si l'on envisage une proposition relative sans la particule אֲשֶׁר תַּעֲרַךְ: כַּעֲרוֹנָה תַּעֲרַכָּה.

Nous le voyons, Jérôme s'est inspiré d'Aquila, mais à la différence d'Aquila, Jérôme n'offre pas d'équivalent pour le premier mot אֵיל / אֵיל: il passe directement au verbe תַּעֲרַן, qu'il interprète deux fois: d'abord, d'après le substantif עֲרוֹנָה (étymologie), puis d'après le verbe proche עָרַךְ (assonance). Sa dépendance vis-à-vis d'Aquila le force, en effet, à être créatif, car le verbe "praeparatum esse" convient dans les deux stiques, alors que la traduction stéréotypée "étymologique" d'Aquila ("être divisé en parterres") était absurde dans le deuxième stique. Mais évidemment, l'on est en droit de s'étonner de cette traduction latine, qui s'éloigne du modèle hébraïque auquel elle est censée être plus fidèle que l'ancienne traduction latine reposant sur la LXX!

Il est intéressant de noter que Jérôme est partagé face à Aquila. En effet, dans sa Lettre 57³³, Jérôme prend ses distances par rapport au réviseur: "Pour Aquila, prosélyte et interprète méticuleux, qui s'est efforcé de traduire non seulement les mots, mais encore les étymologies, c'est à bon droit que nous le rejetons." Mais, par ailleurs, il a suivi Aquila dans sa traduction étymologique de Moïse cornu et, dans sa Lettre 36, 12, loue au contraire son zèle: "Dans

³⁰ Que Jérôme connaît: par exemple, en Dt 12,15, le TM כַּאֵיל a été traduit par "sicut ... cervum".

³¹ Que Jérôme ne semble pas connaître, puisque là où il figure vraisemblablement (Is 1,29; 57,5; 61, 3), la forme plurielle אֵילִים / אֵילִים a été confondue, comme dans la LXX, avec אֱלֹהִים "les dieux".

³² Ainsi, en Jl 2,5, le participe masculin עָרַךְ a été traduit par "praeparatus".

³³ *Saint Jérôme, Lettres*, Volume II, (traduction J. Labourt; Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1951), 71.

Aquila, par exemple, lequel, non pas par esprit de chicane excessif, comme le croient certains, mais par scrupule de conscience, traduit mot par mot, le passage où les Septante portent: “à la cinquième génération”, etc.”³⁴

2. Jérôme et le Targoum: 1 R 22, 38

Dans un article précédent consacré à Jérôme³⁵, j'avais souligné que non seulement Jérôme connaissait diverses traditions exégétiques targoumiques, puisque nous les voyons affleurer dans ses Commentaires, mais aussi que, à l'occasion, sa traduction de la Vulgate coïncidait avec le Targoum, s'éloignant dès lors de son modèle hébraïque. Jérôme avait appris l'araméen, aidé en cela, vraisemblablement par sa familiarité avec le syriaque. Dans le prologue de sa traduction de Daniel, en effet, il affirme avoir suivi les cours d'un “Hébreu”, qui l'a encouragé à surmonter son désespoir d'avoir à tout recommencer après la difficile conquête de la langue hébraïque.

Examinons un nouvel exemple de cette influence probable des traditions targoumiques. En 1 R 22,38, le récit de la mort d'Achab, percé d'une flèche araméenne dans son char de combat, s'achève par la réalisation de la funeste prédiction d'Elie: “On lava à grande eau son char à l'étang de Samarie, les chiens lapèrent le sang *et les prostituées s'y baignèrent*, selon la parole que Yahvé avait dite.”

De fait, le prophète avait annoncé que les chiens laperaient le sang du meurtrier de Naboth (1 R 21,19), mais le TM ne faisait aucunement mention de prostituées dans la sanction annoncée par Elie.³⁶ Que viennent-elles faire dans la réalisation de la sanction? Ces prostituées viennent-elles alourdir encore la sanction du roi, désacraliser davantage encore sa mémoire? Cependant, la sanction maximale qui puisse atteindre un cadavre, dans les récits bibliques, semble bien être la privation de sépulture, qui laisse dès lors la dépouille en proie aux oiseaux et aux chiens. Ainsi, bien que Jézabel soit fille de roi, telle est sa sanction (1 R 21,23-24; 2 R 9,34-37); même si on souligne “ses prostitutions” (2 R 9,22), il n'est pas question de prostituées qui viendraient encore davantage profaner le cadavre de la princesse phénicienne.

³⁴ *Aquila, namque, qui non contentiosius, ut quidam putant, sed studiosius verbum interpretatur ad verbum...*

³⁵ A-F. Loiseau, “Jérôme et les traditions targoumiques”, *JSCS* 44 (2011), 81-126.

³⁶ Certes, la LXX de 1 R 21,19 parle des prostituées, mais ce n'est qu'une harmonisation avec 1 R 22,38. Dans les deux versets, la LXX ajoute en outre des porcs (animaux impurs) pour laper le sang avec les chiens.

Ces prostituées sont-elles apparues dans le récit, de quelque manière que ce soit, en raison de leur association avec le terme “chien” (prostitué mâle) en Dt 23,19: “Tu n'apporteras pas à la maison de Yahvé ton Dieu le salaire *d'une prostituée* (זִנָּה) ni le paiement *d'un chien* (כֶּלֶב), quel que soit le vœu que tu aies fait : car tous deux sont en abomination à Yahvé ton Dieu.”

Ou bien encore, ces prostituées sont-elles le résultat d'une erreur de transmission? La LXX reflète en tout cas le TM זִנָּה: καὶ αἱ πόρναι ἐλούσαντο ἐν τῷ αἵματι “et les prostituées se lavèrent dans le sang”.

La traduction du Tg, toutefois, reste proche matériellement du TM, mais écarte les prostituées au profit des *armes* (מִנֵּי יָרֵיחַ “ses ustensiles d'armes”, c-à-d “ses armes”), ce qui donne un récit plus cohérent, puisqu'on lave à présent le char *et les armes* ensanglantées du roi: “Et on lava à grande eau le char dans le bassin de Samarie et les chiens lapèrent son sang, *et ses armes, ils les lavèrent à grande eau* selon la parole de Yhwh qu'il avait dite par l'intermédiaire d'Elie.”

D.J. Harrington et A.J. Saldarini, dans leur commentaire pour la série “The Aramaic Bible”³⁷, adhèrent à l'explication donnée par L. Smolar et M. Aberbach. Ces auteurs expliquent que les traducteurs araméens du Targoum Yonathan ont jugé bon d'expurger à l'occasion les Ecritures, “de peur que les gens ordinaires ne prennent le langage parfois très cru des prophètes et les images de nature sexuelle pour de la licence.”³⁸ Ils ont donc favorisé les euphémismes et les circonlocutions. C'est parmi ces corrections puritaines que Smolar et Aberbach rangent la traduction en “armes”, qui serait destinée à éviter la profanation dégradante d'un roi défunt d'Israël; pour appuyer ce jugement, ils rappellent que, à l'époque talmudique, les rabbins montraient un respect considérable même pour les rois ou dirigeants non juifs³⁹.

Pour ma part, il ne me semble pas qu'il faille mettre sur le même pied cette traduction du Tg 1 R 22,38, concernant Achab, et d'autres exemples que Smolar et Aberbach citent, comme les atténuations des chapitres 16 et 23 d'Ezéchiel (p. 52), dont la crudité est inégalée dans la Bible, et ce, concernant Jérusalem!

³⁷ D.J. Harrington et A.J. Saldarini, *Targum Jonathan of the Former Prophets*, AB 11 (Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1987), 261 n. 40: “MT: ‘harlots washed’. Tg connects the MT harlotry (זִנָּה) with Aramaic for weapons (זִנָּה) and softens Ahab's fate. S-A 51.”

³⁸ L. Smolar et M. Aberbach, *Studies in Targum Jonathan to the Prophets* (New York: KTAV, 1983), 49: “The relatively unrestrained language of the prophets, and the rough language to be found occasionally in various parts of the Bible could not be conveyed literally to the ordinary people who might all too easily mistake linguistic frankness and sexual imagery for licence.”

³⁹ L. Smolar et M. Aberbach, *Studies*, 51. Ces auteurs mentionnent également TB *Sanh.* 39b, où il ne serait pas question de vraies prostituées, mais seulement d'images peintes par Jézabel dans le char d'Achab pour l'exciter.

Ou encore, les écarts par respect dans les passages concernant le Dieu d'Israël! Ici, il s'agit d'Achab, qui fit "pire" que tous ses prédécesseurs (1 R 16,30) et, suite à son mariage avec Jézabel, rendit un culte à Baal (v. 31), lui installa un autel à Samarie (v. 32), fit un pieu sacré et irrita Yhwh plus que tous ses prédécesseurs (v. 33). De même, en 1 R 21,25 (TM = Tg), le constat est très sévère à son endroit, même si la faute est en partie rejetée sur sa femme: "Il n'y eut vraiment personne comme Akhab pour se livrer à de mauvaises actions aux yeux du Seigneur, car sa femme Jézabel l'avait dévoyé" (TOB) Toute sa descendance sera exterminée sur l'ordre de Dieu. D'ailleurs, dans le TB *Sanh.* 39a, il est dit en toutes lettres que "la maison d'Achab n'est pas conviée à la bénédiction".

La traduction du Tg, selon moi, n'a donc pas ici pour but d'atténuer le texte, mais elle vise à rétablir l'identité parfaite entre l'annonce du châtement et le châtement lui-même (selon le principe de l'harmonisation intra-biblique), tout en suivant le texte massorétique de près, à sa manière, au moyen de la technique de l'assonance (entre "les prostituées" et "les armes")⁴⁰. Comme précisé dans la note 36, la LXX a opéré le contraire, puisqu'elle a inséré les prostituées dans l'annonce du châtement par Elie. Le Tg obtient ainsi un récit tout à fait cohérent, où les chiens lapent le sang du roi dans le fond du char, avant que celui-ci ne soit lavé à grande eau, ainsi que les armes du roi.

Peut-être faut-il même aller plus loin et penser que le texte hébreu primitif évoquait lui aussi les armes. Il aurait existé en hébreu un substantif équivalent à l'araméen ܐܪܡܝܢ / ܐܪܡܝܢ; c'est l'option qu'avait choisie, par exemple, John Gray⁴¹. Ou alors, peut-être faut-il penser au substantif [אָרֶז], qui figure en Dt 23,14 et semble bien être un collectif désignant l'équipement, les instruments (dont fait

⁴⁰ Le Tg présente assez souvent un énoncé matériellement proche du TM. Citons par exemple le Tg Is 66,9 qui a "décrypté" le TM, mais en restant proche matériellement de celui-ci par le biais de la métathèse: Ouvrirais-je le sein (אֶשְׁבֵּר) pour ne pas faire naître? dit Yahvé. Si c'est moi qui fais naître, fermerai-je le sein? dit ton Dieu. (BJ) - Tg: "C'est moi, Dieu, qui ai créé le monde dès le commencement (בְּרִיתָ עֲלָמָא מִבְּרִישִׁית), a dit le Seigneur, c'est moi qui ai créé tout homme; c'est moi qui les ai dispersés chez les nations; et je suis même prêt à rassembler ta communauté d'exil, a dit ton Dieu." Le verbe אֶשְׁבֵּר "je fais éclater" (le sein maternel lors de la naissance) a été amplifié, dans le Tg par "j'ai créé depuis le commencement", périphrase proche par le sens, mais aussi par les consonnes, disposées en métathèse dans le cas de מִבְּרִישִׁית. Le Tg s'est écarté de l'énoncé hébreu, jugé trop charnel pour Dieu, tout en évoquant les deux thèmes capitaux de la création et de l'exil.

⁴¹ John Gray, *I & II Kings. A Commentary*, OTL (Londres: SCM Press, 1970), 448: Gray traduit "... and they washed the weapons"; Note a: "Reading *hazzeyanot* for MT *hazzonot*..." Et il développe cette option à la page 455. Ni BDB ni HALOT ni Clines ne présentent une hypothèse similaire.

partie le piquet יָחַד, qui permettra d'enfouir les excréments)? Certes, ce substantif est un hapax, et en outre la LXX (ζώνη “la ceinture”) semble avoir lu le proche אָזוֹר.⁴² Faut-il restituer ce substantif comme texte primitif pour ce passage, au lieu des “prostituées”? Ou bien le Tg a-t-il interprété les “prostituées” d’après ce substantif? En Tg Dt 23,14, il y a hésitation dans la tradition textuelle entre אֵין (= TM) et יָין “l’arme”.

Même s’il faut faire l’hypothèse d’un leçon primitive en “armes” ou “équipement”, “les prostituées” (*lectio facilior*?) s’étaient de toute façon imposées dans la transmission, ainsi qu’en témoigne la LXX⁴³, et le traducteur araméen avait certainement sous les yeux un texte consonantique et une tradition de vocalisation coïncidant avec le TM. A l’occasion, certes, des traductions doubles du Tg montre qu’il connaissait encore des variantes⁴⁴, mais en général, les Targoumim travaillent sur un texte canonique stabilisé⁴⁵. Dans notre verset, le verbe רָחַץ du TM admettant un usage intransitif (“se laver”) et un usage transitif (“laver”), le Tg a pu passer des “prostituées” qui se lavent (sujet du verbe dans le TM) aux “armes” qu’on lave (complément d’objet du verbe).

La Vg s’écarte, elle aussi, du TM et ne fait pas non plus mention des prostituées: “et laverunt currum in piscina Samariae et linxerunt canes sanguinem eius et *habenas* laverunt iuxta verbum Domini quod locutus fuerat” (“Et ils lavèrent le char dans le bassin de Samarie et des chiens lapèrent son sang, et ils lavèrent *les rênes* (du char) selon la parole du Seigneur qu’il avait dite”).

Tout comme le Tg, Jérôme a interprété le verbe רָחַץ comme un verbe transitif. Par ailleurs, il a traduit les “prostituées” par “les rênes” (*habenas*). Ce substantif pl. *habenae* apparaît une deuxième fois dans la Vg, en Nah 2,4 pour traduire un substantif hapax douteux [פִּלְדָּרָה], mais de toute façon, dans ce verset de Nahum, il désigne clairement les rênes du char (*habenae currus*). Toutefois, ce substantif latin peut être utilisé au singulier pour une courroie de fronde ou de javelot⁴⁶, ou un fouet.

⁴² Les traductions des réviseurs grecs n’ont pas été conservées pour ce substantif.

⁴³ Nous n’avons pas conservé ce verset dans les recensions de Qumran.

⁴⁴ Un exemple bien connu est la double traduction du nom d’Héliopolis en Is 19, 18: עִיר הַהָרָס “ville de destruction”, où הָרָס est une déformation tendancieuse de הַחֶרֶס “le soleil”, puisque le Tg traduit: בֵּית שֶׁמֶשׁ דַּעֲתִידָא לְמַחֲרָב “la ville du soleil qui est sur le point d’être en ruines”. Ou encore en 1 R 9,8, le TM fautif (וְהַבֵּית הַזֶּה יִהְיֶה עֲלֵינוּ), où עֲלֵינוּ a remplacé le primitif לְעֵינַי, le Tg offre les deux leçons combinées: “Et cette Maison, qui était élevée (עֲלֵא), sera en ruine (חֲרִיב)”.

⁴⁵ Ici, la seule “variante” que nous trouvons est dans le TB *Sanh.* 39a, où Rabbi Eleazar interprète הַזֵּנוֹת d’après le proche חֲזִינוֹת: des visions (avec la gutturale *heth*).

⁴⁶ Cf. Oxford Latin Dictionary, s.v. *habena*: a strap, thong, cord; used in throwing missiles ex. a javelin.

Manifestement, Jérôme, qui travaille lui aussi sur un texte stabilisé coïncidant avec le TM, poursuit le même objectif que le Tg: harmoniser l'imprécation d'Elie contre Achab avec la réalisation de cette imprécation et, pour ce faire, éliminer les prostituées. Dans sa traduction, on lave le char et les rênes du char, ce qui forme un tout absolument cohérent. A-t-il été inspiré jusque dans les mots par la tradition targoumique, et partant des "armes", il aurait pensé à la courroie de fronde ou de javelot, et de là, aux rênes? Sans doute ne faut-il pas aller trop loin dans les détails, mais observer uniquement que Jérôme, inspiré vraisemblablement par les traditions targoumiques, a recentré le récit pour éliminer les prostituées du TM, qui surgissaient de nulle part.

Conclusion

En guise de brève conclusion, il nous faut donc retenir de ces quelques exemples combien Jérôme a taché de transmettre, dans sa traduction latine de la Bible, le meilleur de l'immense documentation à laquelle il avait accès, qu'il s'agisse des traductions des LXX et des réviseurs grecs (surtout Aquila et Symmaque) ou des traditions exégétiques de ses maîtres juifs (traditions orales ou fixées dans les Targoumin), même si, à l'occasion, son zèle l'entraîne à s'éloigner de son modèle en hébreu!

ANNE-FRANÇOISE LOISEAU
Institut d'Etudes Théologiques
Bruxelles, Belgique
afloiseaumottet@hotmail.be

Beobachtungen zu den Bibelziten der „Lex Dei“ sive „Mosaicarum et Romanarum legum collatio“¹

FELIX ALBRECHT

Die „*Lex Dei* sive *Mosaicarum et Romanarum legum collatio*“ (CPL 168) bietet einen in mehrfacher Hinsicht, sowohl theologisch als auch rechtsgeschichtlich, außergewöhnlichen Vergleich zwischen dem mosaischen Recht des Alten Testaments und dem römischen Recht. Darüber hinaus ist die *Lex Dei* aus bibelphilologischer Perspektive ein wichtiger Textzeuge der *Vetus Latina*, welcher ausgewählte Passagen des Pentateuchs in einer Textform der *Vetus Latina* bietet, die von den übrigen uns bekannten vorhieronymianischen Textformen nicht unwesentlich divergiert: Zum einen hat der Autor den Bibeltext an den juristischen Kontext seiner Argumentationsführung angepasst. Zum anderen benutzte er eine Version der *Vetus Latina*, deren griechische Vorlage in manchen Punkten von der Septuaginta abweicht. Letzteres soll im Folgenden exemplarisch untersucht werden.

Vorab ein paar einführende Worte zum eigentümlichen Werk der *Lex Dei*.² Die Schrift behandelt in 16 Abschnitten verschiedene juristische Sachverhalte.

¹ Der vorliegende Beitrag geht im Wesentlichen auf einen Vortrag zurück, den der Verfasser unter dem Titel „Moyses dicit: Philologische Beobachtungen zum Pentateuch der Lex Dei“ im Jahr 2012 in Rom anlässlich des XL. „Incontro di Studiosi dell’Antichità Cristiana“ gehalten hat.

² Die *Lex Dei* ist lediglich in drei Handschriften überliefert: *Cod. Berolinensis Lat. fol.* 269 (B), 8.–10. Jh. (Mommsen: 9. Jh.), mit dem Apograph *Cod. Leid.*; *Cod. Vercellensis* 122 (V), 10.–11. Jh. (Mommsen: 10. Jh.); *Cod. Vindobonensis* 2160 (W), 10.–11. Jh. (Mommsen: 10. Jh.). Als Textgrundlage dient die Edition von Theodor Mommsen, *Mosaicarum et Romanarum legum collatio*, *Collectio librorum iuris antejustiniani* 3 (Berlin 1890). Die Ausgaben von P.F. Girard/F. Senn, *Textes de droit romain*, Bd. I (Paris 1967), Nr. 29, 545–590 und S. Riccobono, *Fontes iuris Romani antejustiniani in usum scholarum*, Bd. II, Auctores (Florenz 1968), 541–589, besitzen keinen textkritischen Apparat und geben lediglich den Text Mommsens wieder. Wertvoll ist indes die von M. Hyamson, *Mosaicarum et Romanarum legum collatio. With Introduction, Facsimile and Transcription of the Berlin Codex, Translation, Notes and Appendices* (Oxford 1913), besorgte Faksimile-Ausgabe der Berliner Hs., die im Folgenden gelegentlich konsultiert worden ist. Wiederum nicht berücksichtigt ist die Edition von P.E. Huschke/B. Kübler, *Iurisprudentiae antejustinianae*

Diese Abschnitte gliedern sich nach einem einheitlichen Schema: Zu Beginn wird, eingeleitet als Wort des Mose (16x), ein Passus aus dem Pentateuch zitiert.³ Im Anschluss daran folgen jeweils verschiedene juristische Lehrmeinungen; explizit werden genannt: Paulus (35x), Ulpianus (19x), Gregorianus (7x), Papinianus (5x), Modestinus (2x), Hermogenianus (2x) und Gaius (1x). Bekanntlich sind ebengerade Papinian, Paulus, Gaius, Ulpian und Modestinus die klassischen fünf Zitierjuristen, die von Theodosius II. (401–450) und Valentinian III. (419–455) im Zitiergesetz von 426 (*Codex Theodosianus* I,4,3) als maßgebliche Rechtsautoritäten genannt werden.⁴ Nicht zuletzt deshalb wird häufig ein Zusammenhang zwischen der *Lex Dei* und dem Umfeld des *Codex Theodosianus* vermutet. Datierung und Verfasserfrage dieses Werkes bleiben jedenfalls umstritten.⁵ Da das Neue Testament in keiner Weise benutzt wird

reliquias in usum maxime academicum compositas a Ph. Eduardo Huschke Bd. II/2 (Leipzig 1927), 329–394, die schlechterdings hinter der Edition Mommsens zurücksteht. – Zur Textkonstitution vgl. F. Schulz, „The Manuscripts of the *Collatio legum Mosaicarum et Romanarum*“, in: M. David u.a. (Hgg.), *Symbolae ad jus et historiam antiquitatis pertinentes*, FS J. Ch. van Oven (Leiden 1946), 313–332; demnach gilt als textkritische Leitregel, dass ein Zusammengehen von B mit V oder W für die Ursprünglichkeit einer Lesart spricht. Schulz zufolge ist die textkritische Arbeit Mommsens im Einzelfall kritisch zu hinterfragen. Der vorliegende Beitrag kann dies nur bestätigen; dazu s.u. mit Anm. 27.

³ Einzig *Lex Dei* §16,1,1 verwendet die abweichende Zitationsformel: *scriptura divina sic dicit*.

⁴ Gaius (ca. 150), Papinian (ca. 150–212), Ulpian (ca. 170–223), Iulius Paulus (Ende 2. Jh., Anfang 3. Jh.), Herennius Modestinus (Mitte 3. Jh.).

⁵ Als Verfasser werden beispielsweise genannt: *Rufinus* (P.E. Huschke, „Über Alter und Verfasser der *legum Mosaicarum et Romanarum collatio* nebst kritischen Beiträgen zum Text derselben“, *Zeitschrift für geschichtliche Rechtswissenschaft* 13 [1846], 1–49, hier: 24–31); *Hieronymus* (M. Conrat, „Hieronymus und die *Collatio legum Mosaicarum et Romanorum*“, *Hermes* 35 [1900], 344–347); *Ambrosius* (A.F. Rudorff, *Über den Ursprung und die Bestimmung der Lex Dei oder Mosaicarum et Romanarum legum collatio*, Abhandlungen der Königlich Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin. Philosophisch-historische Klasse 1868 (Berlin 1869), 265–297; C. Hohenlohe, „Um die Geheimnisse der ‚*Collatio legum mosaicarum et romanorum*‘“, *Studia et documenta historiae et iuris* 5 [1939], 486–490, bes. 488); *Ambrosiaster* (J. Wittig, *Der Ambrosiaster „Hilarius“*. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Papstes Damasus I., Kirchengeschichtliche Abhandlungen 4/1, [Breslau 1906]; H.J. Vogels, „Die Überlieferung des Ambrosiasterkommentars zu den Paulinischen Briefen“, *Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Philologisch-Historische Klasse* 1959/7 [Göttingen 1959], 107–142, hier: 107; U. Manthe: „Wurde die *Collatio* vom Ambrosiaster Isaak geschrieben?“, in: H. Altmeyden [Hg.]: *Festschrift für Rolf Knütel zum 70. Geburtstag* [Heidelberg u.a. 2009], 737–754; ders., „Dubletten im Text der *Collatio* als Spuren der Redaktionstätigkeit“, in: K. Muscheler (Hg.), *Römische Jurisprudenz. Dogmatik, Überlieferung, Rezeption*. Festschrift für Detlef Liebs zum 75. Geburtstag, Freiburger rechtsgeschichtliche Abhandlungen N.F. 63 [Berlin 2011], 395–412, hier: 396); *Ps.-Ambrosius* (H.J. Frede, *Kirchenschriftsteller. Verzeichnis und Sigel*,

und christlicher Einfluss nicht nachweisbar ist, überzeugt die Annahme einer jüdischen Verfasserschaft, wie sie maßgeblich von Edoardo Volterra vertreten wurde, mit einer zeitlichen Ansetzung Ende des 4. Jahrhunderts in jüdisch-apologetischem Kontext.⁶ Hauptsächlich versucht die Schrift dabei, den Nach-

Vetus Latina. Reste der altlateinischen Bibel I/1, 3., neubearbeitete und erweiterte Auflage des *Verzeichnis der Sigel für Kirchenschriftsteller* von Bonifatius Fischer, Freiburg 1981, 71; ders., 4. aktualisierte Auflage, Freiburg 1995, 112); *Ps.-Augustinus* (E.J.H. Schrage: „La date de la ‚Collatio Legum Mosaicarum et Romanarum‘, étudiée d’après les citations bibliques“, in: J.A. Ankum u.a. [Hgg.]: *Mélanges Felix Wubbe* [Freiburg 1993], 401–417), oder aber ein namenloser christlicher Jurist (R.M. Frakes, *Compiling the Collatio Legum Mosaicarum et Romanarum in Late Antiquity*, Oxford Studies in Roman Society and Law [Oxford 2012], 149). – Die Datierung hängt im Wesentlichen von der Einschätzung eines Passus’ ab, der die berühmte Konstitution des Jahres 390 nennt (*Lex Dei* 5,3,1-2), der zufolge Homosexualität mit dem Tod durch Verbrennung geahndet wurde, was in Thessaloniki zur Hinrichtung eines bekannten Sportlers und in Folge dessen zu Tumulten in der Bevölkerung führte, die im sogenannten Massaker von Thessaloniki niedergeschlagen wurden. Manche Kommentatoren gehen bei der fraglichen Stelle von einer späteren Interpolation aus, so A. Masi, „Contributi ad una datazione della ‚Collatio legum Mosaicarum et Romanarum‘“, *Bullettino dell’Istituto di Diritto Romano „Vittorio Scialoja“* 64 (1961), 285–321; ders., „Ancora sulla datazione della ‚Collatio legum Mosaicarum et Romanarum‘“, *Studi Senesi* 77 (1965), 415–432; G. Cervenca, „Ancora sul problema della datazione della ‚Collatio Legum Mosaicarum et Romanarum‘“, *Studia et documenta historiae et iuris* 29 (1963), 253–276; F. Siegert, *Einleitung in die hellenistisch-jüdische Literatur. Apokrypha, Pseudepigrapha und Fragmente verlorener Autorenwerke* (Berlin u.a. 2016), 456 mit Anm. 100. Zu Recht wendet H.L. Nelson, *Überlieferung, Aufbau und Stil von Gai Institutiones* (Leiden 1981), 104f., Anm. 1 dagegen ein: „Unseres Erachtens ist es nicht statthaft, den Passus 5, 3, 1-2 lediglich deshalb für unecht zu erklären, weil er der These der Frühdatierung im Wege steht“. Demgegenüber sieht Nelson, *Überlieferung*, 108–113, in *Lex Dei* 5,3,1-2 vielmehr den entscheidenden Anhaltspunkt für eine Datierung der *Lex Dei* zwischen dem 14. Mai und dem 6. August des Jahres 390 n. Chr. in Rom. Frakes, *Compiling*, 149, verortet die Schrift „in Italy in the early 390s“; Schrage, „Date“, 415, vermutet, die *Lex Dei* entstamme „un milieu africain“.

⁶ Vgl. E. Volterra, *Collatio legum Mosaicarum et Romanarum*, Memorie della Reale Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei. Classe di scienze morali storiche e filologiche VI, 3/1 (Rom 1930), 3f.; A.M. Rabello, „Alcune note sulla ‚Collatio Legum Mosaicarum et Romanarum‘ e sul luogo d’origine“, in: *Scritti sull’ebraismo in memoria di Guido Bedarida* (Florenz 1966), 177–186; ders., „Sull’ebraicità dell’autore della ‘Collatio legum Mosaicarum et Romanarum‘“, *La Rassegna Mensile di Israel* 33 (1967), 339–349; E. Bammel, „Fabula seductoria“, *Bulletin of the Institute of Jewish Studies* 1 (1973), 13–18 = ders., *Judaica I*, WUNT 37 (Tübingen 1986), 247–252; L. Cracco Ruggini, „Ebrei e Romani a confronto nell’Italia tardoantica“, *Italia Judaica. Atti del I Convegno internazionale*, Bari 18–22 maggio 1981 (Saggi 2) (Rom 1983), 38–65; G. Barone Adesi, „L’età della Lex Dei“, *Pubblicazioni dell’Istituto di Diritto Romano e dei Diritti dell’Oriente Mediterraneo* 71 (Neapel 1992), 185–193, der den Ursprung der *Lex Dei* im römischen Judentum spätdiokletianischer Zeit sucht und mit einer theodosianischen Rezension rechnet; G. Pugliese,

weis über die Konformität des mosaischen Rechts mit dem römischen zu erbringen und den christlichen Polemiken zu begegnen, welche ebengerade die Devianz beider Rechtssysteme behaupten.⁷

Die Bibelzitate der Lex Dei

Die Bibelzitate der *Lex Dei* decken die wichtigsten Gesetzescorpora des Pentateuch ab:⁸ Den Dekalog (Ex 20,1-17), das Bundesbuch (Ex 20,22–23,33), das Heiligkeitsgesetz (Lev 17–26) und das deuteronomische Gesetz (Dtn 12–26). Darüber hinaus finden wir eine Auswahl verschiedener Gesetzestexte, namentlich Bestimmungen zur Erbbordnung (Num 27,1-11), zum Totschlag (Num 35,1-34) und zum Bund zwischen Gott und seinem Volk (Dtn 27,9-26).

Die Bibelzitate der *Lex Dei* wurden mehrfach untersucht. Besonders hervorzuheben sind die Arbeiten Volterras und Smits sowie der Beitrag von Fritz

„A Suggestion on the Collatio“, in: *Israel Law Review* 29 (1995), 161–175; R. González Salinero, „Influencias e interferencias del Derecho romano en la Collatio legum Mosaicarum et Romanarum“, in: ders./M.T. Ortega Monasterio (Hgg.), *Fuentes clásicas en el judaísmo. de Sophia a Hokmah*, Seminario Hispano-Italiano de Estudios sobre el Judaísmo 1 (Madrid 2009), 87–105; L.V. Rutgers, „The Hidden Heritage of Diaspora Judaism“, *Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology* 20 (Löwen²1998), 235–284, für den die *Lex Dei* eines der wenigen erhaltenen literarischen Zeugnisse des spätantiken Diasporajudentums ist: „the *Collatio* was the last major Jewish apologetic work to be written in antiquity“ (ebd. 277); und im Anschluss an Rutgers T. Ilan, „The Torah of the Jews of Ancient Rome“, in: *Jewish Studies Quarterly* 16 (2009), 363–395, hier: 373. – Wie man Volterras Argumente für ‚schwerwiegend‘ halten und gleichzeitig Ambrosius zum Verfasser der *Lex Dei* erklären kann, bleibt unverständlich; so aber C. Hohenlohe, *Ursprung und Zweck der Collatio legum Mosaicarum et Romanarum* (Wien 1935), 9f. Um einiges charmanter ist dagegen die von Wittig vorgetragene Annahme, der Verfasser der *Lex Dei* sei mit *Isaac Iudaeus* zu identifizieren, der wiederum mit dem Verfasser des *Ambrosiaster* identisch sei; Wittig, *Ambrosiaster*; vgl. J. Wittig, „Filastrius, Gaudentius und Ambrosiaster. Eine literarhistorische Studie“, in: ders. u.a. (Hgg.): *Ambrosiaster-Studien*, Kirchengeschichtliche Abhandlungen 8 (Breslau 1909), 1–56, hier: 11–12. Ebendiese These vertritt neuerdings wieder Manthe: *Collatio*, Zusppruch erfahrend von M. von Albrecht, *Geschichte der römischen Literatur. Von Andronicus bis Boethius und ihr Fortwirken*, Bd. II (Berlin u.a. ³2012), 1300, Anm. 8.

⁷ Vgl. E. Volterra, *Collatio*, 3f.

⁸ Die *Lex Dei* enthält in der Reihenfolge ihres Vorkommens die folgenden Pentateuchzitate: §1,1,1: Num 35,16-21 – §1,5,1: Num 35,22-25 – §2,1,1: Ex 21,18f. – §3,1,1: Ex 21,20f. – §4,1,1: Lev 20,10; Ex 22,16f. – §5,1,1: Lev 20,13 – §6,1,1: Lev 20,11f. – §7,1,1: Dtn 27,22f. – §8,1,1: Dtn 19,16-20 – §9,1,1: Ex 20,16 – §10,1,1: Ex 22,7f. – §11,1,1: Ex 22,1,3. – §12,1,1: Ex 22,6 – §13,1,1: Dtn 19,14 – §14,1,1: Ex 21,17 – §15,1,1: Dtn 18,10-14 – §16,1,1: Num 27,1-8.11. – Als Textgrundlage dient die *Editio critica maior* des Göttinger Septuaginta-Unternehmens: I. *Genesis* 1974; II.1 *Exodus* 1991; II.2 *Leviticus* 1986; III.1 *Numeri* 1982; III.2 *Deuteronomium* ¹1977, ²2006.

Schulz aus dem Jahr 1936.⁹ All jene Studien entstanden in einer Zeit, zu der die Göttinger *Editio critica maior* der Septuaginta zum Pentateuch noch nicht vorlag. Entsprechend fehlte wichtiges Vergleichsmaterial. Im Jahre 2007 veröffentlichte schließlich Robert Frakes einen Beitrag zum Verhältnis der *Lex Dei* zur lateinischen Bibel, in dem er die Auffassung vertritt, dem Text läge eine christliche Bibelversion zugrunde.¹⁰

Demgegenüber steht die klassische Annahme Volterras, der Verfasser der *Lex Dei* sei nicht Christ, sondern Jude gewesen, der mit den Grundsätzen der jüdischen Bibelexegese vertraut war und die Septuaginta als Grundlage seiner

⁹ E. Volterra, *Collatio*; N. Smits, *Mosaicarum et Romanarum legum collatio* (Haarlem 1934); F. Schulz, „Die biblischen Texte in der Collatio legum Mosaicarum et Romanarum“, *Studia et documenta historiae et iuris* 2 (1936), 20–43. – Vgl. ferner E. Bammel, „Fabula“, 1973, 14 = ders., *Fabula* 1986, 248, der auf die Korrespondenz Julius Wellhausens mit Theodor Mommsen verweist, in der Wellhausen Beobachtungen zu *Lex Dei* 15,1,1 (Dtn 18,10–14) anstellt; vgl. die (unvollständige) Edition des Briefwechsels bei E. Bammel, „Judentum, Christentum und Heidentum. Julius Wellhausens Briefe an Theodor Mommsen 1881–1902“, *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 80 (1969), 221–254, hier: 246–248, und neuerdings (vollständig) die vorzügliche Edition von R. Smend, *Julius Wellhausen, Briefe* (Tübingen 2013), 233–235 (Nr. 323–325) mit 697 (Anm. zu Nr. 323–325).

¹⁰ R.M. Frakes, „The Lex Dei and the Latin Bible“, *HThR* 100 (2007), 425–441, bes. 438; ders., *Compiling*, 82–97 („The Collator’s Bible“); vgl. ähnlich D. Liebs, *Die Jurisprudenz im spätantiken Italien (260–640 n. Chr.)*, Freiburger Rechtsgeschichtliche Abhandlungen N.F. 8 (Berlin 1987), 162–174; P.E. Pieler: „Lex Christiana“, in: D. Simon (Hg.), *Akten des 26. Deutschen Rechtshistorikertages, Frankfurt am Main, 22. bis 26. September 1986*, Ius commune. Veröffentlichungen des Max-Planck-Instituts für Europäische Rechtsgeschichte Frankfurt am Main. Sonderhefte, *Studien zur europäischen Rechtsgeschichte* 30 (Frankfurt a. M. 1987), 485–503; Schrage, „Date“. – Frakes sieht eine Nähe des Bibeltextes der *Lex Dei* zur Lyon-Handschrift der *Vetus Latina*. Da diese *Vetus Latina*-Handschrift eine christliche ist, vermutet Frakes kurzerhand, der Verfasser der *Lex Dei* sei Christ gewesen: „the use of a Christian translation confirms the Christian identity of the compiler. While Volterra’s thesis of a Jewish collator was daring, the close connection of the text of the compiler’s biblical quotations to that of the Christian Old Latin Bible demonstrates the collator was most likely connected to the Christian community“. Der Vorwurf Frakes’ gegenüber Volterra, es sei „gewagt“, von einem jüdischen Verfasser auszugehen, wird den ernstzunehmenden Argumenten Volterras nicht gerecht. Im Übrigen ist Frakes in seiner Analyse des Bibeltextes mehr als ungenau; so übergeht er im Fall von *Lex Dei* 2,1,1 wesentliche Varianten, die das Exoduszitat der *Lex Dei* im Vergleich mit dem Wortlaut der Lyon-Handschrift aufweist (s. die ausführliche Analyse des besagten Exoduszitats im vorliegenden Beitrag) und behauptet gar, es bestünde eine „close relationship“ (Frakes, „Compiling“, 94). Auch Schrage, „Date“, bes. 416, nimmt aufgrund einer Untersuchung der Bibelzitate an, es handle sich um einen christlichen Verfasser. Seines Erachtens hätten die verwendeten Bibelzitate der *Lex Dei* größte Nähe insbesondere zum ps.-augustinianischen *Speculum* (Ps.-Augustinus, *Liber de divinis scripturis*, ed. F. Wehrich, CSEL 12, Wien 1889, 287–700); dem schließt sich von der Sache her an: C. Krampe, „Collatio legum Mosaicarum et Romanarum“, *Lexikon der antiken christlichen Literatur* (Freiburg u.a. ³1998), 159–160, hier: 159.

Übersetzung wählte. Wobei letztlich kaum zu klären sein dürfte, ob der Verfasser seine Übersetzung selbständig aus dem Griechischen verfertigte oder auf bereits vorhandene lateinische Übersetzungen zurückgriff. Da Volterra in seiner gründlichen Studie zu dem Ergebnis gelangte, es müsse sich um einen jüdischen Verfasser handeln, verwundert umso mehr, dass er gleichzeitig bemerkte, der Bibeltext der *Lex Dei* zeige keinerlei Ähnlichkeit mit den Bibelversionen der jüdischen Rezensenten: „Quanto alle altre versioni greche e latine, esse non sembrano avere esercitato alcuna influenza sul traduttore. Il confronto con i rari frammenti delle antiche versioni di Aquila, Teodoziona e Simmaco, conservatici da Origene e dal testo siriano ci dimostra che non esiste nessuna relazione con esse“.¹¹

Das Untersuchungsergebnis Volterras zum Bibeltext der *Lex Dei* bleibt kritisch zu hinterfragen und vor dem Hintergrund der gegenwärtigen Septuaginta-Forschung zu überprüfen. Anders als Volterra meine ich, im Bibeltext der *Lex Dei* sehr wohl Spuren jüdischer Rezensionstätigkeit nachweisen zu können, was im Folgenden exemplarisch am 2. Kapitel der *Lex Dei* aufgezeigt werden soll.

Spuren jüdischer Rezensionstätigkeit am Beispiel von Lex Dei 2,1,1

Das mit den Worten „Über schreckliches Unrecht“ überschriebene zweite Kapitel der *Lex Dei* setzt mit einem Zitat von Ex 21,18f. ein. Dieser Passus des Bundesbuches beschreibt den Tatbestand der vorsätzlichen Körperverletzung und regelt die entsprechenden Schadensersatzansprüche. Im Folgenden soll es aber nicht um den juristischen Sachverhalt und dessen Darlegung, sondern vielmehr um eine philologische Betrachtung der Textform des Bibelzitates gehen. Werfen wir zunächst einen Blick auf Ex 21,18 im Wortlaut der *Lex Dei*:

Moses dicit:
Si autem contenderint duo viri
et percusserit alter alterum la-
pide aut pugno et non fuerit
mortuus, decubuerit autem in
lectulo [...].

Mose spricht:
 Wenn aber zwei Männer *miteinander ge-*
stritten haben (contenderint) und *einer*
den anderen (alter alterum) mit einem
 Stein oder mit der Faust geschlagen hat,
 und er nicht gestorben ist, er aber im Bett
 liegt [...].

¹¹ Volterra, *Collatio*, 55.

Zunächst ist dieser Vers mit der Septuaginta zu vergleichen. Dort heißt es:

ἐὰν δὲ λοιδορῶνται δύο	Wenn sich aber zwei Männer <i>beschimpfen</i>
ἄνδρες καὶ πατάξῃ τις τὸν	(λοιδορῶνται) und <i>einer den Nächsten</i> (τις
πλησίον λίθῳ ἢ πυγμῇ, καὶ	τὸν πλησίον) mit einem Stein oder mit der
μὴ ἀποθάνῃ, κατακλιθῇ δὲ	Faust geschlagen hat, und er nicht gestor-
ἐπὶ τὴν κοίτην [...].	ben ist, er aber im Bett liegt [...].

In zwei Punkten weicht die lateinische Textform der *Lex Dei* von der Septuagintafassung ab:

1) Anstelle des Verbuns λοιδορεῖσθαι („sich beschimpfen“)¹² bietet die *Lex Dei* das Verbum *contendere* („sich kämpferisch streiten“). Dem lateinischen *contendere* entspricht griechisch διαμάχεσθαι. Die griechische Vorlage des von der *Lex Dei* gebotenen *contenderint* lautete demnach nicht λοιδορῶνται (lat. *litigaverint*), sondern vielmehr διαμάχωνται. Ebendieses διαμάχωνται bietet nun aber die Version des Symmachus zur Stelle.¹³ Das ist mehr als bloßer Zufall. John William Wevers, der Herausgeber der *Editio critica maior* des Exodusbuches für die Göttinger Septuaginta, scheint diese Variante übersehen zu haben.¹⁴ Desgleichen die bisherigen Kommentatoren der *Lex Dei*.¹⁵

2) Anstelle der Wendung τις τὸν πλησίον bietet die *Lex Dei* die lateinische Übersetzung: *alter alterum*. Ganz zu Recht hat Volterra auf die Nähe dieser

¹² Das abgesehen von 2Makk 12,14 ausschließlich im Pentateuch, und dort nur siebenmal, verwendete Verbum λοιδορεῖσθαι gibt die hebräische Wurzel לִיָּד wieder. Diese hebräische Wurzel begegnet uns 42mal im Alten Testament. Im Pentateuch (7x) wird sie immer mit λοιδορεῖσθαι, in Neh (3x) stets mit μάχεσθαι wiedergegeben.

¹³ F. Field, *Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt sive veterum interpretum Graecorum in totum Vetus Testamentum fragmenta*, Bd. I, Oxford 1875, 118, weist die Lesart διαμάχωνται fälschlicherweise Aquila zu; Wevers/ Quast: *Exodus*, 252, demgegenüber richtigerweise Symmachus. – In Dtn 33,8e ist ἐδοκίμασας (laut Field: Hexaplorum fragmenta I, 325, vielleicht auch ἐδίκασας) die Übersetzung des Symmachus für ἐλοιδόρησαν. Allerdings birgt diese Stelle eine ganz eigene Problematik und ist nicht ohne Weiteres mit Ex 21,18f. zu vergleichen.

¹⁴ Dass es sich nur um ein Versehen handeln kann, ist daran ersichtlich, dass Wevers zu Ex 21,19f. immerhin siebenmal geflissentlich die *Lex Dei* als Zeuge wenig aussagekräftiger Varianten im Apparat seiner Ausgabe verzeichnet.

¹⁵ Volterra, *Collatio*, 59 beispielsweise erwähnt diese Variante mit keiner Silbe. Ebenso wenig Frakes, *Compiling*, 93–95, in seiner Untersuchung des Zitats von Ex 21,18f. in *Lex Dei* 2,1,1.

Übersetzung zu den jüdischen Rezensionen zur Stelle verwiesen: „Il percosse-rit alter alterum non è conforme al testo della Sept. [...], mentre si avviciner-ebbe alle traduzioni di Aquila, di Simmaco e di Teodoziona“.¹⁶

Der Variantenreichtum in der Textüberlieferung zur Stelle ist groß:¹⁷ Eine Handschrift stimmt jedoch weitestgehend mit dem Wortlaut der *Lex Dei* überein. Es handelt sich um Handschrift Rahlfs-Nr. 527 (Paris, Bibl. De l’Arsenal, 8415, 14. Jh.; kurz: Ra 527). Diese ist aus zwei unterschiedlichen Vorlagen geflossen und gehört zwei verschiedenen Textgruppen an.¹⁸ In unserem Fall ist sie Repräsentantin der y-Gruppe (Ra 121-318-392-527). Ein besonderes Charakteristikum dieser Handschrift, die einige kommentierende Randnoten enthält¹⁹, ist ihre an manchen Stellen zu beobachtende Nähe zu Ra 707²⁰, eine Handschrift, welche insbesondere für ihre hexaplarischen Noten bekannt ist. Ra 527 liest nun anstelle von τις τὸν πλησίον vielmehr: ἕτερος τὸν ἕτερον ἡγουν τὸν πλησίον. Offensichtlich verzeichnet die Handschrift für das Lemma τὸν πλησίον eine dublierte Lesart aus τὸν ἕτερον und τὸν πλησίον, anders gesagt, zwei konflatierte alternative Lesarten.²¹ Eine dieser Lesarten, namentlich

¹⁶ Volterra, *Collatio*, 59.

¹⁷ Die Lesart τις bezeugen unter anderem *Cod. Alexandrinus* (A), *Cod. Coislinianus* 1 (M) und die Catenengruppe (C); ὁ εἷς *Cod. Ambrosianus* S.P.51 (F); ἕτερος Ra 707 und Ra 527; eine Auslassung haben *Cod. Vaticanus* (B) und die hexaplarische Rezension (O).

¹⁸ Bis Ex 28,7 repräsentiert Ra 527 die y-Gruppe (Ra 121-318-392-527), ab Ex 28,8 die x-Gruppe (Ra 71-527-619). – Die Vorlage der y-Gruppe scheint am Ende beschädigt gewesen zu sein: Ex 28,22-34 ist doppelt geschrieben, und zwar das erste Mal nach 28,7 eingefügt. Der kodikologische Befund legt folgende Erklärung nahe: Der Schreiber nutzte zwei Handschriften. Die erste Handschrift (y-Gruppe) endete auf einer Seite, die mit Ex 28,7 schloss und im Anschluss daran ein Einzelblatt enthielt, dessen Recto Ex 28,7-21 und dessen Verso Ex 28,22-34 bot. Dieses Einzelblatt scheint lose gewesen zu sein; Recto und Verso wurden deshalb vertauscht, so dass der Schreiber zunächst Ex 28,22-34 abschrieb und im Anschluss daran mit Ex 28,7-21 fortfuhr. Daraufhin war der Schreiber genötigt, auf eine andere Vorlage zurückzugreifen. Er wählte eine zweite Handschrift (x-Gruppe) und nahm seine Arbeit erneut mit Ex 28,22 auf.

¹⁹ An vielen Stellen stimmen die Randnoten der Handschrift Ra 527 mit dem Kommentar des Theodoret überein: Vgl. zu Ex 28,4 (Ra 527, f. 49r) die Randnote zum Lemma ἐπωμίδα: ἐπωμῖς καὶ ἐφεστρίς λέγεται. ἐν δὲ ταῖς βασιλείαις ἐφοῦδ καλεῖται κατὰ τὴν τῶν ἐβραίων γλῶτταν. Diese Angaben entsprechen dem Kommentar Theodorets, *Quaest. in Exod.* 55, PG 80, 285C.

²⁰ Im direkten Kontext unserer Stelle (Ex 21) zeigen Ra 527 und Ra 707 die folgenden Bindefehler gegen die gesamte Überlieferung: V. 2 fin] + ἀνευ ἀργυρίου (ex V. 11); V. 6 προστᾶζει 1°] pr καὶ = MT; V. 18 τις] ἕτερος; V. 36 καὶ 1°] ἦ.

²¹ Dasselbe Phänomen zweier mit ἡγουν verbundener alternativer Lesarten findet sich auch andernorts im Pentateuch, vgl. etwa Ra 799 zu Ex 12,34: σταῖς] σταῖς ἡγουν τὸ ἄλευρον 799; Ra 376 zu Num 19,18: τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἡγουν] τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἡγουν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου 376.

τὸν ἕτερον, stimmt mit der Vorlage des Bibeltextes der *Lex Dei* überein. Die Herkunft dieser Lesart bleibt freilich im Dunkeln. Da es sich nun aber um eine ‚echte‘ Wortlautvariante handelt, ist am ehesten anzunehmen, dass sie einer der abweichenden Rezensionen der Septuaginta entstammt. Die christliche Rezension des Lukian, an die man bei ihrer Vorliebe für derartige Dubletten zunächst denken würde, scheidet von vornherein aus, da sie bekanntlich für den Pentateuch nicht nachweisbar ist.²² Somit kommen nur die jüdischen Rezensionen in Frage. Leider ist uns nun aber kein hexaplarisches Vergleichsmaterial zur Stelle erhalten, das direkten Aufschluss über den Ursprung der Lesart geben könnte. Dennoch ist es am wahrscheinlichsten, von einer Lesart aus dem Bereich der jüdischen Rezensionen auszugehen. Diese Rezensionen orientieren sich allesamt am Hebräischen.

Die hebräische Wendung in Form des Masoretischen Textes lautet folgendermaßen: „ein Mann seinen Nächsten“ (אִישׁ אֶת-רֵעֵהוּ). Der Syrohexapla zufolge geben Aquila, Symmachus und Theodotion das hebräische אִישׁ zur Stelle mit ἀνὴρ wieder.²³ Wenigstens für Aquila entspricht dies der Regel.²⁴ Die Septuaginta hingegen übersetzt das hebräische אִישׁ je nach Kontext auf unterschiedliche Weise, beispielsweise mit τις, ἕκαστος oder ἕτερος.²⁵ Das hebräische אִישׁ schließlich wird im Pentateuch von der Septuaginta mit ἕτερος oder πλησίον wiedergegeben; die origeneische Rezension, Aquila, Symmachus und Theodotion bieten im Pentateuch das Übersetzungsäquivalent πλησίον.²⁶ Daraus folgt, dass zumindest Aquila mit seiner konsequenten Übersetzungsweise als

²² John William Wevers Aussagen zur Genesis gelten in Bezug auf das lukianische Problem für den gesamten Pentateuch. Vgl. J.W. Wevers, *Text History of the Greek Genesis*, AAWG.PH Dritte Folge, 81 = Mitteilungen des Septuaginta-Unternehmens 11 (Göttingen 1974), 158–175.

²³ Auch eine Randlesart des *Cod. Ambrosianus* A 147 inf. (F⁴) bezeugt ἀνὴρ als *varia lectio* zur Stelle. Vgl. dazu M. Fincati, *The Medieval Revision of the Ambrosian Hexateuch*, DSI 5 (Göttingen, 2016), 165.

²⁴ Vgl. neben Ex 21,18: Ex 4,10 (α', σ'); 16,16 (α', θ'); 30,38 (α', θ'); 35,23 (α', σ', θ'); *passim*. – Ein statistischer Vergleich auf Grundlage des Aquila-Indexes (J. Reider/N. Turner, *An Index to Aquila. Greek-Hebrew, Hebrew-Greek, Latin-Hebrew. With the Syriac and Armenian Evidence*, VTS 12 (Leiden 1966), ergibt für den Pentateuch folgende Äquivalente Aquilas für das hebräische אִישׁ: ἀνὴρ (24x), τις (2x). Die Angabe, zweimal würde Aquila das hebräische אִישׁ mit τις übersetzen, ist erläuterungsbedürftig: Fälschlicherweise führt der Aquila-Index als Beleg Ex 21,18 an: doch übersetzt Aquila auch dort mit ἀνὴρ; Ex 21,33 schließlich, der zweite im Aquila-Index genannte Beleg, bildet somit im Pentateuch die einzige Ausnahme von der Regel, dass Aquila für das hebräische אִישׁ als Übersetzungsäquivalent ἀνὴρ wählt.

²⁵ Zu ἕτερος vgl. Num 14,4; Jes 13,8 *passim*. Zu ἕκαστος vgl.: Jes 41,6; Jer 9,4 *passim*. Zu τις vgl. Ex 21,18.

²⁶ Für πλησίον als Übersetzungsäquivalent zu אִישׁ vgl. Dtn 19,11 (ο', α', σ', θ'); 22,24 (ο', α', σ', θ').

im Hintergrund dieser Variante stehender Übersetzer ausscheidet. Da nun aber gerade Symmachus auf einen ausgewogenen und feinen griechischen Stil bedacht war, bei dem nicht der Ausgangs-, sondern der Zieltext im Mittelpunkt stand, spricht m.E. nichts dagegen, hierin eine Symmachus-Lesart zu vermuten.

Betrachten wir nun Ex 21,19 zunächst wieder im Wortlaut der *Lex Dei*:

[...] *et si surgens ambulaverit homo foris in baculo, sine crimine erit ille, qui eum percusserat praeter ac cessationis eius mercedem dabit ei et medico impensas curationis.*

[...] und wenn der Mensch aufgestanden und *draußen am Stab* (*foris in baculo*) umhergegangen ist, soll jener, der diesen geschlagen hatte, ohne Frevel bleiben; außer dass er ihm den Lohn für seine Untätigkeit und dem Arzt die Aufwendungen für die Behandlung geben soll.

Die *Lex Dei* gibt an dieser Stelle *prima facie* den Wortlaut der Septuaginta und den des Masoretischen Textes wieder. Die Septuaginta lautet:

[...] εἰν ἐξαναστὰς ὁ ἄνθρωπος περιπατήσει ἔξω ἐπὶ ῥάβδον, ἄθῳς ἔσται ὁ πατάξας· πλὴν τῆς ἀργίας αὐτοῦ ἀποτεῖσει καὶ τὰ ἰατρῆα.

[...] wenn der Mensch aufgestanden und *draußen am Stab* (ἔξω ἐπὶ ῥάβδον) umhergegangen ist, soll der Schläger unschuldig sein; außer dass er seine Untätigkeit und die Arztkosten bezahlen soll.

Mehrfach wurde nun aber zu Recht betont, dass die Wendung *foris in baculo* („draußen am Stab“) auf Konjektur beruht: Die handschriftliche Überlieferung bezeugt nicht *foris*, sondern vielmehr *fortis*.²⁷ Dies entspricht – wie insbesondere Hyamson und Volterra herausgestellt haben – rabbinischer Exegese, die das על־מַשְׁעֲנֵתוּ – „am Stab“ als „in voller Gesundheit und Stärke“ interpretiert.²⁸ Der jüdische Gelehrte des 12. Jahrhunderts Abraham ibn Esra beispielsweise kommentiert Ex 21,19 folgendermaßen: „Auf die Weisen [...] wollen wir uns (hier) stützen, die erklärten, (der Ausdruck:) על־מַשְׁעֲנֵתוּ (Ex 21,19) (bedeute),

²⁷ Vgl. Volterra, *Collatio*, 60; Hyamson, *Collatio*, 64. – Die übrigen Ausgaben der *Lex Dei* geben zur Stelle lediglich den Text Mommsens wieder und lesen dementsprechend ebenfalls *foris*: Girard/ Senn, *Textes*, 551; Riccobono, *Fontes* II, 548.

²⁸ Hyamson, *Collatio*, 64: „The reading *fortis* in all the MSS. may point to the Rabbinical exegesis which interprets the phrase על־מַשְׁעֲנֵתוּ, usually translated ‚on his staff‘ as meaning „in sound health and strength.“ If so, the author of the *Collatio* [...] has combined the two opposite renderings of the same Hebrew phrase“. Vgl. Volterra, *Collatio*, 60.

daß er sich nicht auf einen anderen stütze, wie es der Brauch (משפט) der Kranken ist, sondern auf sich selbst“.²⁹ Über Abraham ibn Esra hinaus finden sich zahlreiche ältere Belegstellen innerhalb der rabbinischen Literatur, die diesen Vers auf ähnliche Weise interpretieren.³⁰

Ergebnis

Aus der exemplarischen Analyse von Ex 21,18f. in der Textform der *Lex Dei* ergeben sich nun also drei Merkmale: Erstens stimmt unser Text in der Lesart *contenderint* mit der Lesart *διαμάχωνται* des Symmachus überein. Zweitens zeigt unser Text mit der Lesart *alter alterum* eine Übereinstimmung mit der konflatierten Lesart *ἕτερος τὸν ἕτερον ἡγουν τὸν πλησίον* der Handschrift Ra 527; eine Lesart, welche am ehesten einer der jüdischen Rezensionen entstammen dürfte, wohlmöglich ebenfalls Symmachus, da sich zumindest Aquila definitiv ausschließen lässt. Drittens bietet die *Lex Dei* mit der Lesart *fortis in baculo* Anklänge an die rabbinische Interpretation der Textstelle, der zufolge das Gehen am Stab als ein Ausdruck von Stärke verstanden wird, insofern eine Person nicht mehr auf andere, sondern sich selbst stützend als gesund und kräftig wahrgenommen wird.

Diese drei Charakteristika, insbesondere die wörtliche Übereinstimmung mit Symmachus, sprechen für einen Bibeltext als Vorlage der *Lex Dei*, der mit hoher Wahrscheinlichkeit in irgendeiner Weise unter dem Einfluss der Rezension des Symmachus stand. Epiphanius zufolge war Symmachus gebürtiger Samaritaner und lebte zur Zeit des Kaisers Septimius Severus (193–211),³¹

²⁹ D.U. Rottzoll, *Abraham Ibn Esras langer Kommentar zum Buch Exodus*, Bd. II, *Studia Judaica* 17/2 (Berlin u.a. 2000), 673.

³⁰ Vgl. die *Mekhilta de-Rabbi Jishma'el* aus dem 2. Jh. n. Chr., Traktat Neziqin 6 zu Ex 21,18f. (ed. H.S. Horovitz/I.A. Rabin, *Mekhilta d'Rabbi Ismael cum variis lectionibus et adnotationibus* (Jerusalem 1960), 270, Z. 7): „על משענתו. על בוריו“; „an seiner Stütze: in voller Gesundheit“ (G. Stemberger, *Mekhilta de-Rabbi Jishma'el. Ein früher Midrasch zum Buch Exodus* (Berlin 2010), 332, Z. 31f.). Vgl. des Weiteren *Targum Onkelos* zu Ex 21,19 (A. Sperber, *The Pentateuch according to Targum Onkelos. The Bible in Aramaic* 1 [Leiden 1959], 124): „על בוריייה“; „upon his <own> strength“; B. Grossfeld: *The Targum Onkelos to Exodus. Translated, with Apparatus and Notes, The Aramaic Bible* 7 (Edinburgh 1988), 60. Auch *Raschi* (11. Jh. n. Chr.) kommentiert Ex 21,19 auf diese Weise: „Auf seiner eigenen Kraft, auf seine Gesundheit und Kraft gestützt“ (S. Bamberger, *Raschis Pentateuchkommentar. Vollständig ins Deutsche übertragen und mit einer Einleitung versehen* [Basel 1994], 234).

³¹ Epiphanius, *De mens.* 16; vgl. F. Albrecht, „Die Septuaginta. Einführung und Forschungsstand“, *BN* 148 (2011), 35–66, hier: 49–51; ders., „Die alexandrinische Bibel-

konvertierte schließlich zum Judentum und ließ sich ein zweites Mal beschneiden. Die neuere Forschung lokalisiert Symmachus in Galiläa, möglicherweise in Caesarea Maritima um 200 n. Chr. und identifiziert ihn mit Sumkos ben Yosef, einem Schüler Rabbi Meïrs.³² Es dürfte außer Frage stehen, dass die anhand unseres Beispieltextes beobachtete Nähe zur rabbinischen Exegese damit aufs Beste in Einklang zu bringen ist.

Leider ist das hexaplarische Vergleichsmaterial insgesamt sehr spärlich. Auch konnte die gebotene Analyse nur ein einziges Kapitel der *Lex Dei* beleuchten. Dennoch deutet der Befund in eine klare Richtung. Volterras Einschätzung, dass die Bibeltexte der *Lex Dei* keinen nennenswerten Einfluss der jüdischen Rezensionen zeigen – in den Worten Volterras: „non esiste nessuna relazione“ – lässt sich dahingehend korrigieren, dass der Bibeltext der *Lex Dei* durchaus jüdisches Kolorit aufweist. Die grundlegende Hypothese Volterras zur jüdischen Verfasserschaft der *Lex Dei* findet im Übrigen darin ihre Bestätigung.

FELIX ALBRECHT

Akademie der Wissenschaften

Friedländer Weg 11

D-37085 Göttingen, Germany

Felix.Albrecht@uni-goettingen.de

übersetzung. Einsichten zur Entstehungs-, Überlieferungs- und Wirkungsgeschichte der Septuaginta“, in: T. Georges u.a. (Hgg.), *Alexandria*, (Civitatium Orbis MEditerranei Studia 1), Tübingen 2013, 209–243, hier: 224–228.

³² Vgl. A. Geiger, „Symmachus der Übersetzer der Bibel“, *Jüdische Zeitschrift für Wissenschaft und Leben* 1 (1862), 39–64; D. Barthélemy, „Qui est Symmache?“, *CBQ* 36 (1974), 451–465, hier: 460 ff.; N. Fernández Marcos, *The Septuagint in Context. Introduction to the Greek Version of the Bible* (Leiden u.a. 2000), 123–141. Als Möglichkeit erwägt dies auch A. Salvesen, *Symmachus in the Pentateuch*, JSSt.M 15 (Manchester 1991), 297. – Die ältere Forschung sieht in Symmachus einen Repräsentanten des ebionitischen Judenchristentums; vgl. dazu die – Epiphanius widersprechenden – Aussagen des Euseb (*HE* VI,17) und Hieronymus (*De uir. ill.* 54). Für H.J. Schoeps gilt Symmachus daher sogar als „Quellenzeuge erster Ordnung“ für den Ebionitismus: H.J. Schoeps, *Theologie und Geschichte des Judenchristentums* (Tübingen 1949), 33.

Morphology of Compound Greek Numerals

TAKAMITSU MURAOKA

Numerals, cardinal numerals in particular, constitute a vital part of a lexicon of any language. In the Septuagint the numeral $\delta\upsilon\omicron$ occurs more than 600 times. Their forms and syntax, however, like any other feature of Greek, have been subject to constant changes. Because of their intrinsic importance and also in order to improve on descriptions of their use in Septuagint Greek as found in some standard reference works, we have undertaken an enquiry into the cardinals for 11 to 19, then compounded numerals from 21 upwards, thus not tens, hundreds, thousands on one hand, and their corresponding ordinals on the other.¹ Among other things, we are interested in the morphology or shape a numeral above eleven and up to 199 takes, namely 1) the relative sequence of two or three numerical units constituting it and 2) the use or non-use of the linking conjunction καί, how often it is used and where it is inserted. Other issues of interest are interaction between the usage in the Septuagint and its interaction with its Semitic original, the Septuagint usage in comparison with that in Classical Greek, Hellenistic Greek, and New Testament Greek, and finally diversity among Septuagint books in regard to the numerals.

¹ This enquiry of ours has been greatly facilitated by a valuable database created by F.E. König, *Historisch-kritisches Lehrgebäude der hebräischen Sprache* (Leipzig: J.H. Hinrichs, 1895), II 215-25, where for each Hebrew numeral starting with '21' and ending with '1,000,000,' classified according to the configuration of all these numerals such as '100 + 20' (עָשְׂרִים וְיָמָּה Gen 6:3) vs. '20 + 100' (עָשְׂרִים וְיָמָּה Num 7.86) the author provides an exhaustive list of references, a rare exception being the use of "etc." for '30 + 100' (op. cit. 218), an incredible measure of industry and dedication when there was no digitalized Bible around. Not being half as industrious as this towering Semitist-Hebraist, I have systematically looked at all the numerals from 21 to 199, comparing the MT with the Septuagint rendition. Where a Hebrew cardinal numeral is rendered with an ordinal, we have left that out of account, but minor variations between numerals such as '23' vs. '26' have been taken into account. Since we start, for a change, from the target language, there could arise some statistical discrepancies. We do not believe, however, that they would significantly distort the general picture we obtain of Septuagint Greek, as far as the numerals we have investigated are concerned.

1. Cardinals: 11-19

In Classical Greek a digit preceded, followed by the numeral for '10.' And the two constituents were linked with καί. Thus '13' = τρεῖς καὶ δέκα or spelled as one word, i.e. τρεῖσκαίδεκα. '11' and '12' diverged, dispensing with καί and always spelled as one word: '11' = ἑνδεκα and '12' δώδεκα. Probably as a result of the use of letters of the alphabet as substitutes for numerals,² e.g. ιγ' = τρεῖς καὶ δέκα, when a larger number preceded, a form such as δέκα καὶ τρεῖς and δέκα τρεῖς began to become dominant in the Hellenistic period.³ Some examples of this fronting of δέκα are δέκα τρεῖς Josh 18:28A; ἡμερῶν δέκα τεσσάρων Tob 8:19⁶¹; ἔτη δέκα πέντε Isa 38:5; δέκα ἕξ ψυχὰς Gen 46:18; γυναικας δέκα ὀκτὼ 2 Chr 11:21; πόλεις δέκα ἐννέα Josh 19:38A. This relatively rare fronting of δέκα for '12 - 19' in Septuagint Greek, what goes against the Hebrew sequence, can be assumed to have two causes, one external and the other internal: 1) the growing tendency in Hellenistic/Koine Greek and 2) the preponderance of the fronted 'tens' in Hebrew, as we are going to see below.

In terms of their formal make-up the Greek numerals for '11' and '12' are clearly compounded of their respective digit (εἷς and δύο) and the decade '10' (δέκα). But unlike their corresponding Hebrew numerals they stand apart from the 'teens' for '13' up to '19' just as English *eleven* and *twelve* or German *elf* and *zwölf* do. Though the advancing pattern with δέκα fronted did lead to short-lived and hesitant use of forms such as δέκα εἷς, not attested in LXX, and δέκα

² Wackernagel, probably correctly, surmises that this practice cannot have started in spoken Greek: J. Wackernagel, "Zur Wortfolge, besonders bei den Zahlwörtern," in 33-54 in *Festschrift Gustav Binz* (Basel: Benno Schwabe, 1935), 38f. In our times, however, very few people would be puzzled on hearing a TV newscaster mentioning 'the EEC Parliament in Strasbourg.'

³ See E. Schwyzer, *Griechische Grammatik* (München: C.H. Beck, ³1953), I 594; E. Mayser, *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit* (Berlin and Leipzig: Walter de Gruyter, ²1938), I ii § 70, 9; and J.H. Moulton and G. Milligan, *The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament Illustrated from the Papyri and other non-literary Sources* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1930), s.v. δεκαδύο, δεκαέξ, δεκαοκτώ, δεκαπέντε, and δεκατέσσαρες. Compounds with δέκα preceding are used by respectable Hellenistic writers, e.g. δεκαμῖς Plutarch, *Noma* 3.6, δεκαδυο id. *Cat. Min.* 44.5, δεκατέσσαρας Polybius 1.36.11, μετρητὰς ... δέκα καὶ τέτταρας Aristotle, *HA* 596^a 7 [mentioned by Wackernagel op. cit., 39], and δεκαέξ Strabo 2.5.42. As regards instances with καί in Homer such as κοῦροι Βοιωτῶν ἑκατὸν καὶ εἴκοσι βαῖνον *Iliad* 2.510 and ἵππους δὲ ξανθὰς ἑκατὸν καὶ πενήκοντα ib. 11.680 Wackernagel cautions that the metre need be taken into account.

δύο 1 Esd 5:11 and about 40 other instances⁴, the conjunction καί was not generally used to link the two components.⁵

In Classical and Hellenistic/Koine Greek, καί is never inserted for ‘11’ and ‘12.’ Hence δέκα καὶ δύο 1 Chr 6:48⁶ and 2 Chr 33:1⁷ is striking. This peculiar feature can be accounted for in terms of analogy of forms such as εἴκοσι καὶ δύο Jd 10:3AL, which, in its turn, is under the influence of Hebrew to a large extent.

Linkage through καί

The unique status of the Greek numerals for ‘11’ and ‘12’ is also highlighted by the fact that, in contrast to ἑνδεκα and δώδεκα, Greek does not say ἐν εἴκοσι ‘21,’ δύο τριάκοντα ‘32’ etc., but either εἴκοσιν ἐν, εἴκοσι καὶ ἐν or ἐν καὶ εἴκοσι etc.⁸

As regards the use of the linking καί with numerals ‘13 -19’ its insertion is the norm, whether they are spelled as single lexemes or three, thus τρεῖςκαίδεκα or τρεῖς καὶ δέκα, and the digit is always fronted. In the New Testament we come across καί only once, and that in Luke, δέκα καὶ ὀκτὼ ἔτη Luke 13:16, with which compare ἐκεῖνοι οἱ δεκαοκτὼ ib. 13:4. In this respect the situation in Septuagint Greek is remarkably different. For ‘12 - 19’ the pattern <δέκα καὶ +> is attested a mere six times: δέκα καὶ δύο (see above); δέκα καὶ πέντε 3 Kgdms 7:40; δέκα καὶ ἑξ 2 Chr 26:1⁹; δέκα καὶ ὀκτὼ Gen 14:14,

⁴ J. Wevers, in the critical Göttingen edition, reads δώδεκα at Exod 28:21*bis*, rejecting δέκα δύο in Rahlfs’ edition.

⁵ Schwyzer, op. cit., 594, mentions an example occurring in an inscription from Delphi of the 4th century BCE: δέκα εἴς. According to Mayser, loc. cit., ἑνδεκα is attested in two 2nd cent. BCE documents of some literary ambition, but otherwise it is δεκαεῖς, δεκαμία, δεκαέν. Thackeray’s statement is then in need of some nuancing: “ἑνδεκα δώδεκα had taken too deep root to be dislodged and have survived to the present day,” H. St J. Thackeray, *A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek according to the Septuagint* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1909), I 187. He is slightly contradicting himself, when he demonstrates that δεκάδωο [*sic* TM] is firmly attested in a few LXX books, e.g.

⁶ So read in N. Fernández Marcos and J.R. Busto Saiz, *El texto antioqueno de la biblia griega III 1-2 Crónicas* (Madrid: Instituto de Filología del CSIC, 1996), 21, but δέκα δύο 1 Chr 9:22, δεκαδύο ib. 15:10, and δώδεκα ib. 25:9-31. The edition by Rahlfs reads δέκα δύο.

⁷ So read by R. Hanhart in *Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum*, vol. VII, 2: *Paralipomenon liber II* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2014) ad loc.

⁸ Wackernagel, op. cit., 37, draws attention to a difference between ‘11’ and ‘12’ as well in that the former does not innovate by inserting καί as in δυοκαίδεκα.

⁹ So read by Hanhart op. cit., ad loc., but Fernández Marcos and Busto Saiz, op. cit., ad loc., read ἑξκαίδεκα.

Ez 48:35¹⁰. The predominant absence of *καί* in Septuagint Greek in numerals for ‘11 - 19’ is not, in our view, so much a reflection of the contemporary Greek as an influence by the structure of the Hebrew numerals concerned, for in Hebrew the two components for ‘11 - 19’ are never joined with the conjunction *Waw*.

2. 21 - 99

Relative sequence of constituent numerals

We now move to numerals for ‘21 - 99,’ excluding decades. In Hebrew the descending order is in the overwhelming majority, 97 cases in which LXX has an equivalent cardinal numeral as against 20 of ascending order. It is symptomatic that of these 20 cases LXX reverses the order in 12, e.g. *שְׁנֵים עָשָׂר וְעֶשְׂרִים* *υἱὸς εἴκοσι καὶ τριῶν ἐτῶν* 2 Chr 36:2. The remaining cases occur at Gen 11:12, 16, 24, 12:4, Exod 7:7, Jer 25:3, and Ezek 41:6, and only in 8 cases LXX follows the ascending order in the source language – Exod 26:2, 39:6 (LXX 37:2), Lev 25:8, Num 31:38, 39, 40, 3Kgdms 14:20, 2 Esd 1:9. As symptomatic of the dominance of the descending order is that there is only one instance where LXX reverses the sequence: *Ὡν πέντε καὶ εἴκοσι ἐτῶν ἐβασίλευσεν* ‘at the age of 25 years he ascended the throne’ 2 Chr 25:1 (*בְּעֶשְׂרִים וְחָמֵשׁ שָׁנִים*), an analogy of *πέντε καὶ δέκα*? Interestingly, this is immediately followed by *καὶ εἴκοσι ἐννέα ἔτη ἐβασίλευσεν* ‘and he reigned 29 years.’

On Koine Greek Mayser¹¹ writes: “Überhaupt steht bei allen aus Zehnern und Einern, Hunderten und Tausendern zusammengesetzten Zahlen regelmäßig die größere Zahl voran; dann folgt, meist ohne *καί*, die kleinere, und fast immer geht (in Urkunden) das Substantiv voraus.” Can we say then that two forces, the contemporary Koine Greek morphology and the morphology of the source language, combined to bring the descending order to the forefront? Septuagint translators were presumably familiar with, or competent in, not only the source text, but also the morphology of the contemporary, post-biblical Hebrew. A look into the compound numerals ‘11 - 99’ in Qumran Hebrew reveals that the ascending order dominates with 57 instances as against 17 of

¹⁰ At 1 Chr 26:9 the Lucianic version reads *ὀκτὼ καὶ δέκα*, Fernández Marcos and Busto Saiz, op. cit., 63.

¹¹ Op. cit., § 70, 10.

the descending order.¹² As significant is that Qumran Aramaic displays the reverse situation: 18 (descending) vs. 4 (ascending), albeit a modest data-base for comparison with Qumran Hebrew.¹³ It may then be more correct to say that the predominance in SG of the descending order owes more to the translators' exposure to the contemporary Koine Greek, a tendency reinforced by the morphology of the Hebrew source text.

Linkage through καί

Authorities are agreed that the use of καί is rare with numerals for higher than '21'.¹⁴ In SG, however, its insertion is the norm. Of a total of 117 cases of compound cardinal numerals for '21 - 99' we find καί missing in 49 cases. In Hebrew the Waw is ever present in either order. The table below shows more statistical details.

	+ καί	- καί
Heb. <20 + 5> = LXX <20 + 5>	58	38
Heb. <20 + 5> = LXX <5 + 20>	1	
Heb. <5 + 20> = LXX <5 + 20>	6	2
Heb. <5 + 20> = LXX <20 + 5>	3	9
Total	68	49

By contrast, in the New Testament, the particle is present only once, τεσσαράκοντα καὶ ἑξήτεσις 'in 46 years' John 2:20. There are found 10 cases with no καί: e.g. σταδίους εἴκοσι πέντε ἢ τριάκοντα '25 or 30 stadia' ib. 6:19.

This considerably high frequency (58%) of καί in Septuagint Greek is most probably a reflection of the structure of the source language. The translator of Num consistently inserts καί, 5 times (31:38, 39, 40, 35:6, 7), whereas one of Gen is consistent in not reproducing the Hebrew Waw, 8 times (11:12, 16, 24, 12:4, 17:1, 18:25, 46:15, 26). Thus there is a question of translation technique here.

¹² E.g. שמונה ועשרים 4Q321 2.8 vs. עשרים וששה 4Q252 1.6.

¹³ E.g. חמשה ועשרין 4Q209 7ii6 vs. עשרין ות[ר]תין 5Q15 1ii11.

¹⁴ E.g. Mayser, op. cit., § 70, 10 "meist ohne καί"; Schwyzer, op. cit., 594 "selten"; "gewöhnlich ohne καί," F. Blass, A. Debrunner, F. Rehkopf, *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, ¹⁴1976), § 63, f.n. 3.

The comparable statistics for the cardinal numerals ‘101 - 199’ are as below.¹⁵

	+ καί	- καί
Heb. <100 + 5> = LXX <100 + 5>	8	31
Heb. <100 + 5> = LXX <5 + 100>	0	0
Heb. <5 + 100> = LXX <5 + 100>	15	1
Heb. <5 + 100> = LXX <100+ 5>	1	14
Total	24	46

Here again, the dominance of the descending order in Hebrew is marked (56%), albeit not as marked as in the case of numerals for ‘21 - 99’ (83%). We would note the Hebrew ascending order has been reversed in Greek as often as 14 times. Here again the book of Num conforms to the Hebrew order every time (15 times), whereas the translator of Gen reverses the Hebrew order 9 times, keeping to the source text only once (8:3).

As regards the linking of constituents of these compound numerals, one should note that, on the Hebrew side, the Waw may not be repeated more than once¹⁶, e.g. מֵאָה עָשָׂרִים וּשְׁנָיִם 2 Esd 2:27, but it is required between the last two components as against וְאַרְבָּעִים וְחֲמִשָּׁה ib. 2:8. By contrast, Greek can do without καί altogether, e.g. δισχίλιοι ἑκατὸν ἐβδομήκοντα δύο for מֵאָה שְׁבַעִים וּשְׁנָיִם 2 Esd 2:3. A measure of flexibility in Hebrew and Greek alike is illustrated in מֵאָה עָשָׂרִים וּשְׁנָיִם ἑκατὸν καὶ δέκαδου 1 Chr 15:10 // ἑκατὸν δέκα δύο 2 Esd 2:18, but = מֵאָה שְׁנָיִם עָשָׂר Neh 7:24. Note also מֵאָה עָשָׂרִים וּשְׁנָיִם ἑκατὸν εἴκοσι δύο Neh 7:31. All the same, non-representation of the Hebrew Waw is quite extensive – 24 / 70 = 34%. Only in one case the source text lacks an expected Waw, מֵאָה שְׁנָיִם עָשָׂר Neh 7:24, faithfully reproduced as ἑκατὸν δέκα δύο.

3. Ordinal numerals: 11th - 19th

The binary formation pattern in CG for ‘11th - 19th’ was replaced by the simplified, unitary system. The Classical combination of a cardinal and an ordinal ‘10th’ as a fully declined adjective is retained for ‘11th’ and ‘12th’ only, e.g. ἐν τῷ ἑνδεκάτῳ μηνί ‘in the 11th month’ Deut 1:3; ἐν τῇ δωδεκάτῃ τοῦ μηνὸς

¹⁵ We have discovered that König’s sign of despair (“etc.”, see above under fn. 1 above) signifies another ten attestations in the same chapter, 7, of the book of *Numbers*. The table above incorporates these ten instances.

¹⁶ A Hebrew numeral between ‘11’ and ‘19’ is counted as one component.

τοῦ πρώτου ‘on the 12th (day) of the first month’ 2 Esd 8:31. By contrast, for ‘13th - 19th’ the Classical combination of a digit and a decade fully inflected, linked with καί, and both as ordinal as in τρίτος καὶ δέκατος, was supplanted by τρισκαιδέκατος etc., following the same formation pattern as for ‘11th’ and ‘12th,’ though καί is inserted: e.g. τῇ τρισκαιδεκάτῃ τοῦ δωδεκάτου μηνός ‘on the 13th (day) of the 12th month’ Esth 8:12o; ἐν τῷ ἔτει τῷ ἑπτακαιδεκάτῳ ‘in the 17th year’ Jud 1:13; ὀκτωκαιδεκάτῳ ἔτει ‘in the 18th year’ 1 Esd 1:20.

For ‘20th,’ apart from a normally formed εικοστός, εικάς, a feminine substantive, is retained in the sense of ‘20th day (of a month)’ as in ἐν εικάδι τοῦ μηνός ‘on the 20th (day) of the month’ 2 Esd 10:9. It can be linked with an ordinal of a digit, e.g. ἕως τρίτης καὶ εικάδος μηνός Αδαρ ‘till the 23rd (day) of the month of Adar’ 1 Esd 7:5. In the case of ‘21st’ the cardinal may be used, e.g. ἕως ἡμέρας μιᾶς καὶ εικάδος τοῦ μηνός ‘till the 21st (day) of the month’ Ex 12:18. In compounded forms εικάς always follows. SG makes also occasional use of other substantives formed similarly to εικάς. Thus τετράς, e.g. τετράδι τοῦ μηνός τοῦ ἐνάτου ‘on the fourth day of the ninth month’ Zech 7:1. Sometimes in conjunction with εικάς as in Διὸς Κορινθίου τετράδι καὶ εικάδι ‘on the 24th day of the month Dioscurus’ 2 Macc 11:21; τῇ τετράδι καὶ εικάδι τοῦ μηνός τοῦ ἕκτου ‘on the 24th day of the sixth month’ Hag 1:15. In Νηστεία ἢ τετράς καὶ νηστεία ἢ πέμπτη καὶ νηστεία ἢ ἑβδόμη καὶ νηστεία ἢ δεκάτη ‘the fourth fasting ..’ Zech 8:19 τετράς is parallel to normal ordinals, thus being equivalent to τετάρτη¹⁷, cf. τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ τετάρτῃ καὶ εικάδι ‘on the 24th (day)’ Dan 10:4LXX, where ἐν ἡμέρᾳ εικοστῇ καὶ τετάρτῃ TH employs standard ordinals for both components. Lastly, ἑβδομάς is often used in the sense of ‘group consisting of seven’ as in συμφώνων ἀδελφῶν ἑβδομάς ‘a heptad of seven like-minded brothers’ 4 Mac 14:7, and can also refer specifically to a seventh day as in τῆς δὲ ἑβδομάδος ἐπιβαλλούσης ‘the seventh (day) being round the corner’ 2 Macc 12:38, parallel to τὸ σάββατον.

21st and higher

For ordinals ‘21st - 99th’ CG arranges the two components in either sequence. Thackeray (op. cit., 189) states that, in the later portions of the LXX, there is a marked tendency in favour of the descending order. The frequency figures

¹⁷ Here the translator’s knowledge of the Jewish religious calendar seems to have left a little over to be desired; for the source text is not about days of fasting, but of months, hence the first is concerned with a fasting prescribed for the 17th day of Tammuz, the fourth month.

inclusive of ἑκατοστός ‘100th’ added as in ἔτους ἑκατοστοῦ ὀγδοηκοστοῦ καὶ ὀγδόου ‘in the 188th year’ 2 Macc 1:9 are as below:¹⁸

	Ascending	Descending
20 εἰκοστός	8	10
30 τριακοστός	5	10
40 τεσσαρακοστός	6	5
50 πεντηκοστός	5	1
60 ἑξήκοστός	5	1
70 ἑβδομηκοστός	6	0
80 ὀγδοηκοστός	0	1
Total	35	28

The picture is not as clearcut as Thackeray suggests. In LXX books he would count as early we find 13 cases of the descending order – εἰκοστός (1 in 3 Kgdms, 3 in 4 Kgdms), τριακοστός (1 in 3 Kgdms, 5 in 4 Kgdms), τεσσαρακοστός (1 in Josh, 1 in 3 Kgdms), πεντηκοστός (1 in 4 Kgdms) – whilst the sole instance of the ascending order among early books occurs in 3 Kgdms 15:9. These, however, must be set against the remaining 34 instances of the ascending order, all in late books, 1 - 2 Chr, Sir, Ezek, 1 - 2 Chr, 1 - 2 Macc¹⁹. Cp. ἔτους ἑκατοστοῦ τεσσαρακοστοῦ ὀγδόου 2 Macc 11:21, 31, 38 with τῷ δὲ ἐνάτῳ καὶ τεσσαρακοστῷ καὶ ἑκατοστῷ ἔτει ib. 13:1. See also ἐν τῷ εἰκοστῷ καὶ τετάρτῳ ἔτει τοῦ Ἰεροβοαμ 3 Kgdms 15:8 vs. ἐν τῷ ἐνιαυτῷ τῷ τετάρτῳ καὶ εἰκοστῷ τοῦ Ἰεροβοαμ ib. 15:9.²⁰

The constituent numerals are mostly linked through καί, e.g. ὁ δεῦτερος καὶ εἰκοστός 1 Chr 24:17, but ὁ εἰκοστός δεῦτερος ib. 25:29. The conjunction, however, can be absent even with three constituent numerals, e.g. ἔτους ἑκατοστοῦ τεσσαρακοστοῦ ὀγδόου ‘in the 148th year’ 2 Macc 11:21, 33 // πρῶτῳ καὶ ἑκατοστῷ καὶ πεντηκοστῷ ἔτει ‘in the 151st year’ ib. 14:4. In one

¹⁸ Checked with the Accordance Bible for LXX I.

¹⁹ Though Thackeray does not say whether the question of translated books or original Greek compositions has any relevance in this regard, we are assigning here 2 Macc to a late book, the only original composition in this particular issue; the instances in question number only two, 2 Macc 13:1, 14:4.

²⁰ MT does not mention the year in vs. 8, whereas in vs. 9 it reads עשרים. Against MT וְעָשְׂרִים אֶחָד 1 Chr 25:28, וְעָשְׂרִים שְׁנָיִם ib. 25:29, וְעָשְׂרִים שְׁלֹשָׁה ib. 25:30, and וְעָשְׂרִים אַרְבָּעָה ib. 25:31, LXX (Rahlfs) reads ὁ εἰκοστός πρῶτος .. ὁ εἰκοστός δεῦτερος .. ὁ τρίτος καὶ εἰκοστός .. ὁ τέταρτος καὶ εἰκοστός, whereas the Lucianic version is consistent with .. ὁ εἰκοστός τρίτος .. ὁ εἰκοστός τέταρτος, but ὁ πρῶτος καὶ εἰκοστός .. ὁ δεῦτερος καὶ εἰκοστός ib. 24:17 (MT וְעָשְׂרִים אֶחָד :: עשרים שנים)!

tripartite example we miss καί between the first two constituents: ἔτους ἑκατοστοῦ ὀγδοηκοστοῦ καὶ ὀγδόου 2 Macc 1:10. Two rare cases of the missing καί are ὁ εἰκοστὸς πρῶτος 1 Chr 25:28 and ὁ εἰκοστὸς δεῦτερος ib. 25:29. The use or non-use of καί appears to be free. The sequence of the constituents appears irrelevant. See the above-cited ἐν τῷ εἰκοστῷ καὶ τετάρτῳ ἔτει τοῦ Ιεροβοαμ 3 Kgdms 15:8 vs. ἐν τῷ ἐνιαυτῷ τῷ τετάρτῳ καὶ εἰκοστῷ τοῦ Ιεροβοαμ ib. 15:9.

Apart from ἑκατοστός ‘100th,’ quite common, though confined to 1 - 2 Macc, rare examples of ordinals for other hundreds are ἐν τῷ τεσσαρακοστῷ καὶ τετρακοσιοστῷ ἔτει ‘in the 440th year’ 3 Kgdms 6:1; ἐν τῷ ἐνὶ καὶ ἑξακοσιοστῷ ἔτει ‘in the 601st year’ Gen 8:13.

4. Result

Summing up in brief one could say that, as in many features of its language, the LXX emerges also in respect of its use of numerals as standing in the natural evolution of Greek and sharing some innovations with the contemporary Hellenistic / Koine Greek, and that some, but not all by any means, of the innovative features reflect the structure of the Semitic, source languages. Furthermore, here also Septuagint Greek is not monolithic, characterized by its diversity among books and authors/translators of the Septuagint.

TAKAMITSU MURAOKA

Oegstgeest

The Netherlands

muraol345@gmail.com

Pour une étude conjointe de la version sahidique et du texte grec court du livre de Job

DOMINIQUE MANGIN

Dans une édition *princeps*, jamais actualisée à ce jour, A. Ciasca fut le premier, en 1889, à affirmer que la version copte sahidique représentait le texte pré-origénien de la Septante de *Job*¹ : plus d'un siècle après, la version sahidique suscite toujours autant l'intérêt du critique du texte grec, tout en le laissant sur sa faim, et cela pour trois raisons.

Premièrement, depuis l'époque de A. Ciasca, nous avons à notre disposition une édition critique de la version grecque² et nous pouvons ainsi poser au texte sahidique des questions beaucoup plus précises et plus élaborées que A. Ciasca — qui était un pionnier — ne pouvait le faire. Deuxièmement, l'irremplaçable édition de J. Ziegler comporte cependant — comme A. Pietersma l'a écrit dans sa recension³ — de nombreuses imperfections, y compris dans la brève partie de l'introduction qui concerne la version copte⁴. J'en donne un seul exemple, en rapport avec la traduction de l'introduction de cette édition *princeps*, que je propose ci-dessous. En 30:20b, stique attribué à Théodotion, J. Ziegler indique dans le deuxième apparat critique « om 20b Sa » ; or d'après ce qu'écrit A. Ciasca, p. XXXIII, note *b*, ce stique est omis par le manuscrit IC, mais pas par le manuscrit XXIV. Pour le non-coptisant, ce seul exemple jette le doute sur la mention « Sa » dans l'apparat critique de l'édition de Göttingen, qui est en-deçà des précisions que donnait A. Ciasca à la fin du XIX^e siècle. D'autant

¹ *Sacrorum Bibliorum fragmenta copto-sahidica Musei Borgiani*, vol. II, 1889, XVIII-XXXVII et 1-68. Voir aussi: <https://archive.org/details/sacrorumbiblioru02cias>.

² J. Ziegler, *Iob*, Göttingen, 1982 (désormais J. Ziegler).

³ A. Pietersma, « *Iob. Septuaginta : Vetus Testamentum Graecum*, 11/4, etc. », *JBL* 104 (1985), 305-311. Tenir compte de P. J. Gentry, *The Asterisked Materials in the Greek Job*, Atlanta, 1995. Lire aussi la recension de P.-M. Bogaert : *RTL* 14 (1983), 110-111. À propos des témoins latins, voir P.-M. Bogaert, *Bulletin d'ancienne littérature chrétienne latine*, VI, [150], dans *Rev. bén.* 1983, 1-2, ainsi que P.-M. Bogaert, « *Job latin chez les Pères et dans les Bibles*. D'une version courte à des versions longues sur le grec et sur l'hébreu », *Rev. bén.* 122 (2012), fasc. i, 48-99 ; fasc. ii, 366-393.

⁴ J. Ziegler, 42-45 et 147-149.

que A. Ciasca présentait les témoins d'une façon nuancée, se demandant déjà si la version copte ne comprenait pas des traces de révisions hexaplaïres ; or le critique du texte grec court ne se pose pas aujourd'hui d'autre question. Lors d'une communication que j'ai présentée sur ce texte grec⁵, N. Bosson avait développé plusieurs autres exemples, qui éclairaient les insuffisances de l'apparat critique de J. Ziegler dans la mention des leçons du copte, insuffisances que le non-coptisant ne peut pas soupçonner⁶. Un nouvel état des recherches sur le texte grec court du livre de Job profiterait grandement d'une nouvelle édition critique de la version copte sahidique de ce livre, qui tienne compte des fragments édités depuis 1889, et qui soit accompagnée, on peut l'espérer, d'une traduction⁷.

Le choix qu'ont fait les éditeurs du texte grec pour établir leur lemme est une troisième raison qui a empêché ou ralenti l'étude conjointe des versions sahidique et grecque. Pour la clarté du propos, il est nécessaire de rappeler brièvement un point d'histoire textuelle qui est bien connu. Origène raconte lui-même dans sa *Lettre à Africanus* qu'il a eu sous les yeux un texte grec du livre de Job qui, globalement, était plus court que le texte hébreu de son époque, celui-ci étant le même que la forme consonantique du texte hébreu qui nous a été transmis ; et il a comblé les manques (on peut l'inférer de divers indices) en insérant les stiques d'une traduction plus récente, celle de Théodotion, tout en gardant les quelques *plus* que le grec comportait par rapport à l'hébreu. Ce « texte long », résultat du travail d'Origène, a été transmis par *tous* les manuscrits grecs et a remplacé le texte qu'Origène avait eu sous les yeux, et dont nous n'avons aujourd'hui aucun témoin ; le seul témoin indirect de grande ampleur est précisément la version copte sahidique. C'est le texte long — plus exactement le texte long fondé sur B-S — que A. Rahlfs, en 1935, et J. Ziegler, en 1982, ont choisi d'éditer. Le choix de J. Ziegler d'éditer le texte qui a été transmis et lu dans l'Église était réaliste et peut-être difficilement évitable, mais il a été critiqué d'une façon circonstanciée et à juste titre par A. Pietersma. Sans entrer dans le détail de la discussion, disons que ce choix a comme grave inconvénient d'éditer en les ponctuant comme s'il s'agissait

⁵ « Le texte court de la version grecque du livre de Job : enjeux d'une traduction annotée », avec comme répondante N. Bosson, Paris-IV, Centre Lenain de Tillemont, 16 mai 2008.

⁶ Les documents de travail de N. Bosson étaient : « Les témoins coptes du livre de Job : améliorations à apporter à l'apparat critique de Ziegler (6:11a, 9:2b-3, 9:14-16, 23:15cd, 28:26a) » ; « Les témoins coptes du livre de Job : synopsis des versets 9:2-4, 9:14-16, 9:32-34, 28:21-28 » ; « Liste des témoins coptes du livre de Job ».

⁷ J. Ziegler, 43-44, donne une liste de fragments coptes sahidiques publiés après 1889.

d'une seule entité deux traductions d'époques différentes⁸ et de mettre la traduction ancienne de Job, témoin du judaïsme de langue grecque (fin du II^e s. av. l'è. chr.), sous l'ascendant conjoint des stiques théodotioniques et de la réception par l'Église du texte origénien (I^{er} - III^e s. de l'è. chr.).

Si l'on cherche à comprendre la première interprétation du livre de Job, qui s'est développée au sein du judaïsme de langue grecque, et qu'on ôte à ce texte long les stiques attribués à Théodotion, on obtient un « texte court » qui n'est pas à proprement parler la traduction ancienne, mais un texte intermédiaire entre le texte long transmis et le Grec ancien à reconstruire. Le texte court, en effet, est loin d'être homogène et pose de nombreuses questions, dont l'exposé excéderait la présente *captatio benevolentiae*⁹.

Certes, la traduction de l'introduction de A. Ciasca que je propose n'apprendra rien aux coptes, lesquels connaissent depuis longtemps la problématique qui lie le texte grec court de *Job* à sa version sahidique. Mais en l'absence d'une édition critique de ce texte court, par cette traduction je marque le regret d'un chercheur qui doit faire l'analyse littéraire d'un texte malheureusement empirique et qui doute que l'édition du Grec ancien de *Job* puisse se faire sans que celle de sa version sahidique ne soit actualisée. Puisse cette simple traduction amorcer un dialogue.

Traduction de A. Ciasca

Sacrorum Bibliorum fragmenta copto-sahidica Musei Borgiani
vol. II, 1889, p. XVIII - XXXVII*

N.d.T. Les notes de bas de page d'A. Ciasca sont appelées par des lettres minuscules suivies d'une parenthèse. Dans la traduction qui suit, j'ai fait précéder ces notes du numéro de la page en chiffres romains, entre crochets droits. Mes propres notes sont appelées par des chiffres arabes.

J'ai remplacé la numérotation des versets de A. Ciasca par celle de l'édition de J. Ziegler, *Iob*, Göttingen, 1982, les stiques étant précisés par les lettres, a, b, c, d, e. Lorsque A. Ciasca mentionne un stique qui est astérisé dans l'édition

⁸ A. Pietersma, *op. cit.*, 307.

⁹ Je me permets de renvoyer à mon étude : « La sagesse dans le chapitre 28 du texte grec court du livre de Job », dans S. Anthonioz et C. Dogniez (dir.), *Représentations et personification de la sagesse dans l'Antiquité*, Paris, Éditions de Boccard (« Orient et Méditerranée »), à paraître.

* Écrite en 2007-08, révisée en 2018, cette traduction a bénéficié des remarques de N. Bosson, D. Julia-Pralon, B. Meynadier, Ph. Le Moigne et S. Douek, que je remercie.

de J. Ziegler, j'ai ajouté l'indication θ' (par ex. $\theta'9:24bc$) ; lorsque le stique relève du texte court, j'ai ajouté l'indication G si cela était nécessaire (par ex. G9:25a), et une fois α' (Aquila).

[Page XVIII] VIII. Parmi les premiers¹⁰, avant tous les autres, on doit examiner le livre de Job, qui, presque entièrement conservé, occupe la première place dans ce volume. Ce livre est principalement contenu dans deux manuscrits en parchemin de la collection Borgia, notés par les numéros XXIV et XXV dans le catalogue de Zoega. L'un, constitué de soixante-dix huit feuillets (305 x 245 mm), mutilé au début et à la fin, comprend les Proverbes, du chapitre 20, verset 3 jusqu'à la fin du livre, l'Ecclésiaste presque complet (p. 103) et le livre de Job, du début jusqu'au chapitre 39, verset 9a. Le nombre de lignes dans chaque page oscille entre vingt-six et trente : les numéros des pages commencent à 65, cahier 5, et vont jusqu'à 143, cahier 10 — 78-79 étant notés deux fois ; à partir de là commence le livre de Job et une nouvelle numérotation des pages et des cahiers à partir de 1, de telle sorte que, comme l'écrivait à juste titre Zoega, le feuillet qui est noté au recto 143 présente au verso le chiffre 1 ; il en ressort clairement que des paginations différentes ont été employées dans un seul et même livre et qu'il arrive que ce qu'on pourrait prendre pour les fragments de deux codex sont souvent les fragments d'un seul codex ^{a)}. Le manuscrit s'interrompt à la page 77, à savoir au septième feuillet du cahier 5 de la seconde numérotation, dans laquelle le copiste s'est trompé trois fois de la même façon : de 18 il a sauté à 21, de 36 à 38, et plus loin le chiffre 54 est apposé sur deux feuillets. Nous avons donné un spécimen du tracé des lettres dans la table XXVI, extrait du livre de l'Ecclésiaste, chapitre 1, versets 1 à 6. L'autre codex, conservé à Naples, à la Bibliothèque nationale sous la cote 1 B 18, numéro XX, comporte huit feuillets (290 x 250 mm), dont les pages de trente lignes portent les numéros 87-102. Ils comprennent la dernière partie du livre de Job, du chapitre 40, verset 8 jusqu'à la fin du livre, et une partie des Proverbes, du chapitre 1 au chapitre 3, verset 19. Un spécimen du tracé des lettres de cette dernière partie est montré à la table XIX, où « l'on voit [p. XIX] quatre figures dessinées à l'encre noire, qui représentent Job avec ses filles. Job lui-même, haut de presque dix pouces, est revêtu d'une tunique courte avec une cuirasse et un manteau militaire, et porte sur la tête un diadème de pierreries avec une auréole

¹⁰ C'est-à-dire, parmi les manuscrits sahidiques de la Bible les moins touchés par la révision origénienne : voir à la fin du § VII, p. XVIII : *alii quidem plus, alii minus puri...* ; *alii autem...*

^{a)} [p. XVIII] G. Zoega, *Catalogus codicum copticorum manu scriptorum*, Romae, 1810, 178.

qui entoure son visage. Il est barbu et porte de la main droite une lance, et de la gauche un globe. Ses filles, revêtues de tuniques et de manteaux, portent des diadèmes, des colliers et des ceintures ornées de perles. Bien que la représentation soit due à une main qui manque d'habileté, au reste assez proche de l'art byzantin, elle conserve cependant les caractères d'un siècle plus raffiné, si du moins — et ce n'est pas douteux — il semble que ce codex doive être mis au nombre des plus anciens » ^{a)}.

Outre ces deux principaux et remarquables codex, qui comprennent le livre entier de Job à l'exception de trente-trois stiques¹¹, on a trois autres manuscrits, qui conservent seulement quelques fragments du même livre. Ce sont les codex XXXII et IC de notre collection, dont on a la description dans le premier volume de notre ouvrage, pages XXV-XXVI. Le premier contient 16:14-22, et le second 12:17-13:1, 23:2-24:25, 27:16-28:1, 29:21-30:29. Un troisième fragment (29:21-30:8a) fut édité par Adolphe Erman à partir du codex D de la Bodleian Library dans *Bruchstücke der oberoegyptischen Uebersetzung des Alten Testaments*.

IX. D'après les diverses leçons de ces codex que nous avons notées dans l'apparat en leur place, il apparaît très clairement que les quatre premiers contiennent la version sahidique de *Job* faite directement sur la traduction anté-origénienne des Soixante-dix traducteurs ; mais que le dernier présente la même édition corrigée d'après les codex hexaplaire. En outre, afin que soit bien claire la vérité de la première thèse, il faut apprendre d'Origène ce qu'était la version alexandrine de *Job* avant les Hexaples. Celui-ci en effet, parlant des additions qui existaient de son temps dans cette même édition, ainsi que de ce qui y manquait, affirme : « Autre exemple : dans le livre de Job, le texte qui commence par “ *Et il est écrit qu'il se relèvera avec ceux que le Seigneur relève* ” (42:17a), et qui se poursuit jusqu'à la fin du livre, ne se trouve pas chez les Hébreux, et par conséquent pas davantage chez Aquila ; mais la Septante et Théodotion ont à cet endroit des passages équivalents. Et nous trouvons d'innombrables autres passages chez Job, brefs ou longs, qui sont en plus du texte hébreu dans nos exemplaires. Passages brefs, comme lorsqu'à la phrase “ *il se leva de bonne heure et offrit des sacrifices pour eux, selon leur nombre* ” [1:5bc] est ajouté “ *un veau pour le péché pour leurs âmes* ” (1:5d). Et lorsqu'à la phrase “ *les anges de Dieu vinrent se présenter devant Dieu et le Diable vint avec eux* ” [1:6bc] est joint : “ *parcourant la terre et se promenant sur elle* ” (1:6c). Et en outre après les mots : “ *le Seigneur a donné, le Seigneur*

^{a)} [p. XIX] G. Zoega, *ibid.*

¹¹ Dans l'édition de J. Ziegler, les stiques de 39:9b à 40:7b inclus sont au nombre de 53, dont 36 relèvent du texte court et 17 de Théodotion (voir plus bas, n. 17).

a enlevé » [1:21c], [p. XX] le stique “ *comme il a plu au Seigneur, ainsi fut-il* ” (1:21d) ne se trouve pas dans l'hébreu. Passages plus longs dans nos exemplaires qu'en hébreu : aux paroles que la femme de Job lui dit “ *jusqu'à quand résisteras-tu* ” [2:9b], est ajouté ceci : “ *en disant : voici, je reste encore un peu de temps en attendant l'espoir de mon salut* ” jusqu'à “ *afin que je me repose de mes peines et de mes douleurs qui m'accablent maintenant* ” (2:9b-9dε). Il n'y a en effet, dans le texte hébreu, que ces mots prononcés par sa femme : “ *alors dis un mot contre le Seigneur et meurs* ” [2:9e]. En revanche il y a beaucoup de phrases dans la partie centrale du livre de Job qui se trouvent chez les Hébreux, mais non dans nos exemplaires ; certes, assez souvent, il s'agit de trois ou quatre stiques, mais parfois de quatorze, de dix-neuf ou seize. À quoi bon en donner ici la liste ? Je les ai relevés avec beaucoup de peine pour ne pas ignorer la différence entre les exemplaires juifs et les nôtres. » ^{a)}.

Il faut vraiment déplorer qu'Origène n'ait pas énuméré les stiques qui manquaient dans la traduction des Septante, de la même façon qu'il a au moins cité une partie de ceux qui avaient été ajoutés. Ce défaut d'Adamantius est cependant suppléé en partie par Jérôme, pour ce qui est des copies latines, quand il affirme : « ... si on enlève ce qui a été ajouté sous astérisques, une part importante du livre sera retranchée. Et cela en s'en tenant aux Grecs. Du reste chez les Latins — avant cette traduction que nous avons publiée récemment avec astérisques et obèles — il manque environ sept cents ou huit cents stiques » ^{b)}. Hésychius témoigne du même fait dans ses *Hypotheses in libros sacros* en nous informant que tout le livre de Job contenait deux mille deux cents stiques, dont six cents manquaient, avant Origène. Le docteur Bickell, d'après un calcul scrupuleux, réduit ce chiffre à trois cent soixante-treize ^{c)} ; et nous verrons plus bas que ce chiffre est plus proche de la vérité. Outre ces preuves, une autre, mais qui n'est pas à l'abri du doute, peut être apportée en complément par une paire de manuscrits grecs et une autre de manuscrits latins qui sont parvenus jusqu'à nous munis d'astérisques. Les manuscrits grecs sont le codex 1952 de l'ancienne bibliothèque Colbertine, d'où son nom de *Colbertinus* ; et le codex 346 de la bibliothèque Vaticane, qui est cité dans l'apparat

^{a)} [p. XX] *Lettre à Africanus*, n. 3-4 [Migne, P.G., t. 11, col. 53-56].

^{b)} [p. XX] Préface à la traduction du livre de Job d'après l'hébreu.

^{c)} [p. XX] G. Bickell, *De indole ac ratione versionis Alexandrinae in interpretando libro Jobi*, Marburg, 1862, 30. — Ce qu'on lit à la fin du livre de Job, dans le codex 161 (chez F. Field, *Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt*, Oxonii, 1867-1875, LXVI), est tout à fait étrange, à savoir : « Job, 1 600 stiques, sans compter les astérisques ; 2 200 stiques avec les astérisques » ; et une seconde fois dans le codex *Vaticanus* 346, folio 121 v. : « Job, 1 600 stiques, sans compter les astérisques ; avec les astérisques, il a 2 200 stiques ».

du *Vetus Testamentum graecum cum variis lectionibus* d'Holmes et Parson¹² sous le numéro 248. « Il est clair — écrit à juste titre Bickell — que l'autorité de chacun de ces deux codex est inégale ; il faut louer le *Colbertinus* pour son soin et sa fidélité, puisqu'il indique toujours le numéro des stiques munis d'astérisques et le nom du traducteur d'où ils ont été tirés, et déplorer d'autant plus que du chapitre 10, verset 7 au chapitre 11, verset 11, et à nouveau du chapitre 29 au chapitre 31, verset 6 [p. XXI] il y ait une lacune. Au contraire, le codex *Vaticanus* 346, écrit avec beaucoup moins de soin, présente seulement les astérisques sans la numérotation des stiques, qui, souvent, par erreur, ont été transcrits à un endroit fautif, comme le prouvent la comparaison avec les autres codex et la nature des passages. »^{a)} Et les deux codex latins qui contiennent l'édition hexaplaire de saint Jérôme ne sont pas d'une plus grande valeur. Le premier, de la bibliothèque de Marmoutier, a été édité, dans les œuvres de ce saint docteur, par J. Martianay ; ce dernier, dans son avertissement préliminaire, en parle ainsi : « Quand est parvenu jusqu'à nous ce monument très précieux de l'Antiquité sacrée [...] nous avons découvert que ce livre était précisément celui qu'en son temps Augustin apprécia tellement qu'il loua le soin et la fidélité du traducteur, Jérôme, [...] et de fait, guidés par ces informations des anciens Pères, ceux qui évaluent la vérité avec impartialité nous permettront plus facilement de dénoncer les fautes manifestes de copie et de rechercher les quelques omissions, *je veux dire les signes — obèles ainsi qu'astérisques — qui par l'étourderie des scribes ont été omis ou déplacés dans le manuscrit*¹³. D'autre part nous avons pris soin de suppléer parfois deux points en gras et de délimiter ce qui a été placé sous astérisques ou obèles »^{b)}. D'après cet avertissement de Martianay, il est assez évident que le codex mentionné n'a pas été écrit avec soin et que les signes diacritiques y avaient été ou bien complètement omis ou bien placés de façon erronée, et c'est pourquoi il est très peu fiable de ce point de vue ; et cela est aussi confirmé par Grabe ailleurs. En effet celui-ci, décrivant un autre codex latin de la *Bodleian Library*, numéro 2426,

¹² Oxford, 1798-1827, 5 vol.

^{a)} [p. XXI] G. Bickell, *op. cit.*, 33. — Il faut noter en plus que le *Vaticanus* [346] — qui outre Job comprend les livres de Salomon, la Sagesse, l'Ecclésiaste, Esdras 1 et 2, Esther, Tobit et Judith sans les signes diacritiques d'Origène, mais avec, dans la marge, les variantes d'Aquila, de Symmaque et de Théodotion — a les astérisques écrits en rouge dans la marge latérale, et ne place presque jamais de petit clou à la fin du stique ; d'où naît une très grande incertitude à propos du début et de la fin des mots qui doivent être insérés sous ces signes.

¹³ Les italiques sont de A. Ciasca.

^{b)} [p. XXI] Migne, *P. L.*, t. 29, col. 61.

sign. Nero F. 6-7, affirme : « Enfin, le codex cité de la *Bodleian Library* présente aussi les astérisques et certains obèles, ainsi que les marques finales qui les accompagnent, lesquelles paraissent manquer dans le manuscrit de Paris, à moins que Martianay ne les ait délibérément omises »^{c)}. Il faut noter cependant, comme le reconnaissent les savants, que Grabe lui-même aussi, dans son édition de l'Ancien Testament selon les Soixante-dix traducteurs, a placé les signes diacritiques d'Origène souvent à tort^{d)}.

X. De tous ces faits il ressort assurément que les codex grecs et latins cités — auxquels il faut rattacher aussi la version Syro-hexaplaire mentionnée plus haut¹⁴ — concordent assez peu entre eux [p. XXII] en ce qui concerne le nombre et l'emplacement des obèles et des astérisques ; qu'en conséquence ils laissent la plupart du temps le lecteur dans l'incertitude à propos des omissions ou des additions dans la traduction des Anciens qu'Origène avait signalées par un obèle ou un astérisque. Plus d'une fois, alors que l'un des deux témoins cités marque tel stique d'un astérisque, les autres transmettent le même stique mais sans ce signe. Ainsi, pour donner quelques exemples, en 0'9:24bc, seul *πρόσωπα κριτῶν* [...] τίς ἐστίν est lu sous astérisque par la Syro-hexaplaire, un codex latin et le *Colbertinus* ; le second codex latin en revanche a noté du même signe également le stique G25a. [...] ¹⁵

XI. De ce petit nombre d'exemples il s'ensuit clairement ce que nous avons déjà affirmé plus haut, c'est-à-dire qu'on ne doit guère se fier aux codex qui présentent les signes diacritiques d'Origène pour déterminer la leçon originelle des Soixante-dix traducteurs et reconnaître dans le même temps [p. XXIII] les additions d'Origène. Mais ce que ces témoins ne peuvent garantir, nous prétendons pouvoir l'obtenir de notre version sahidique. En effet, en premier lieu, celle-ci conserve tout ce qu'Origène, dans sa *Lettre à Africanus* mentionnée plus haut, critique comme étant en trop dans l'édition alexandrine — y compris le [*plus de la fin du*] stique 6c du chapitre 1, provenant de la répétition du stique 7c : ἀρκτε πκαε εφμοοϣε ἡζητῖ = περιελθὼν τὴν γῆν καὶ ἐμπεριπατήσας ἐν αὐτῇ. En outre, si l'on excepte le manuscrit 249 de Parson

^{c)} [p. XXI] J. E. Grabe, *Dissertatio de variis vitiis LXX. interpretum versioni*, Oxonii, 1710, 107.

^{d)} [p. XXI] Il faut considérer ce qu'écrivait à ce sujet Bickell — souvent mentionné — dans son ouvrage p. 37.

¹⁴ A. Ciasca évoque la version Syro-hexaplaire notamment au § VI, p. XVI-XVII.

¹⁵ A. Ciasca donne, dans ce passage entre crochets que je ne traduis pas, treize autres exemples de données contradictoires transmises par les témoins : G11:20c, 0'12:21a, 0'13:19b, 0'13:20b, 0'14:18-19, G15: 6b-7a, 0'16:3b, 0'16:21b, 0'17:12a, 0'17:16b, 0'21:21, 0'22:29-30, 0'24: 4b. Les données telles que les présente A. Ciasca, intéressantes à son époque, le sont moins aujourd'hui. Se reporter à l'apparat de l'édition de J. Ziegler pour comprendre les discordances entre témoins dans la mention des signes diacritiques.

et le codex *Alexandrinus*, qui cependant lit à la fin τὴν ὑπ' οὐρανόν à la place de ἐν αὐτῇ, aucun des autres témoins n'a cet ajout. Mais l'argument tiré des ajouts mentionnés ci-dessus — qui plaide en faveur de l'authenticité de la version originelle des Septante existant dans notre édition — a beau avoir probablement une grande valeur, il n'apporte cependant pas de certitude absolue. En effet, tous les codex grecs, ainsi que les versions qui en dérivent, conservent plus ou moins ces ajouts, et pour cela présentent presque le même degré de probabilité. Mais on doit rechercher ce qui tranche indubitablement la question dans les éléments que les traducteurs alexandrins ont omis et qu'Adamantius a restitués en plaçant devant un astérisque. En effet, si jamais on trouve restitués dans une édition, précédés ou pas d'un astérisque, les éléments originellement omis, on peut en conclure qu'elle a été préparée en suivant des codex hexaplaire, et donc qu'elle ne présente pas du tout l'interprétation originelle des Septante. Mais à l'inverse s'il existe une version où font complètement défaut les ajouts apportés par Origène à cette même interprétation, il sera facile de conclure que cette version n'a pas connu l'influence des Hexaples et que pour cette raison, exempte de toute corruption, excepté bien sûr les fautes de copiste, elle conserve jusqu'à aujourd'hui l'édition alexandrine anté-origénienne. Or, en définitive, c'est ce qu'on a dans notre version sahidique. Dans celle-ci, en effet, manquent complètement tous les stiques qui ont été marqués d'un astérisque dans les témoins cités plus haut — soit dans tous, soit dans l'un ou l'autre. On doit donc tenir pour certain que la version ancienne primitive du livre de Job est contenue exempte de toute corruption dans cette traduction. Et pour que cela apparaisse avec plus d'évidence, et qu'en même temps soient appréciés comme il faut la précision et le soin qu'apportent les codex latins et grecs — ainsi que la Syro-hexaplaire — dans la mention des signes origéniens, qu'il soit ici permis de donner la liste de tous les stiques qui manquent dans notre volume, et d'ajouter, à côté, le nom des codex qui signalent ces mêmes stiques d'un astérisque. À savoir :

[N.d.T. *Ci-dessous, les stiques absents de la version sahidique sont donnés non pas d'après la numérotation de A. Ciasca, mais d'après celle de l'édition de J. Ziegler, avec la précision θ', G, ou α'. Lorsque la référence ne désigne qu'une partie de stique, je précise les mots grecs de la leçon. À la suite de certains versets, les informations qui apparaissent sont de A. Ciasca, et concernent les manuscrits coptes ; je les ai mises entre parenthèses pour des raisons de lisibilité. Je n'ai pas traduit ses remarques sur le grec ; se reporter à J. Ziegler.*]

G1:15b ; α'θ' 2:1c παραστήναι ἐναντίον τοῦ κυρίου ; G6:15a οὐ προσεῖδόν με οἱ ἐγγύτατοί μου ; [p. XXIV] θ'7:8ab ; θ'9:24bc ; θ'10:4b ; θ'11:5b ; θ'12:8b-9ab ; θ'12:18b ; θ'12:21a ; θ'12:23ab ; θ'13:19b ; θ'13:20b ; θ'14:18ab-19abc ; θ'15:10ab ; G15:19a ; θ'15:26b-27ab ; θ'16:3b ; θ'16:8abc ; [p. XXV] θ'16:21b (Notre codex XXIV omet les stiques 16:20b-21ab, qui sont restitués, dans cette édition, d'après le manuscrit XXXII) ; θ'17:3b-4ab-5a ; θ'17:10a καὶ δεῦτε δὴ ; θ'17:12ab ; θ'18:9b-10ab ; θ'18:15ab-16ab ; θ'18:17b ; θ'19:24a ; θ'19:28b ; θ'20:9ab ; θ'20:11ab-12ab-13ab ; θ'20:14b ; θ'20:20b-21a ; θ'20:23a ; θ'20:25c ἐπ' αὐτῷ φόβοι ; θ'21:15ab ; [p. XXVI] θ'21:19b ; θ'21:21ab ; θ'21:23ab ; θ'21:28ab-29ab-30ab-31ab-32ab-33abc ; θ'22:3b ; θ'22:13ab-14ab-15ab-16ab ; θ'22:20ab ; θ'22:24ab ; θ'22:29ab-30ab ; θ'23:9ab ; θ'23:15cd ; θ'24:4b ; θ'24:5c ; θ'24:8a ; θ'24:14b-15abc-16abc-17ab-18a ; [p. XXVII] θ'24:25b ; θ'26:5ab-6ab-7ab-8ab-9ab-10ab-11ab ; θ'26:14ab ; θ'27:19b ; θ'27:21ab-22ab-23ab ; θ'28:3bc-4a ; θ'28:5ab-6ab-7ab-8ab-9a ; θ'28:14ab-15ab-16ab-17ab-18ab-19ab ; θ'28:21b-22a ; θ'28:26b-27a ; θ'29:10b-11a ; θ'29:13a ; θ'29:19ab-20ab ; θ'29:24b-25abc (Ces stiques [p. XXVIII] manquent dans les manuscrits coptes XXIV et IC, mais figurent dans le manuscrit D de la *Bodleian Library* édité par Erman, auquel nous les avons empruntés et insérés entre crochets) ; θ'30:1c (Ce stique et les suivants, 30:2ab-3abc-4a et 7a, se trouvent également dans le codex D, à l'instant cité, d'où nous le restituons, tout simplement, inséré entre crochets) ; θ'30:2ab-3abc-4a ; θ'30:7a ; θ'30:11b-12abc-13a ; θ'30:16a ; θ'30:18b ; θ'30:20b (Le codex XXIV présente cette leçon, mais le manuscrit IC l'omet) ; θ'30:27ab ; θ'31:1ab-2ab-3ab-4ab ; θ'31:18ab ; θ'31:23b-24a ; θ'31:27a ; θ'31:35a ; θ'32:4b-5abc ; [p. XXIX] θ'32:11c-12abc ; θ'32:15ab-16ab ; θ'33:8a ; G33:15c-16a (La leçon paraît omise, du fait d'une faute de lecture, à cause de la répétition du nom ρωμε ; en effet le regard du copiste a sauté du premier mot au second) ; θ'33:19b ; θ'33:20b ; θ'33:28ab-29ab ; θ'33:31b-32ab-33ab ; θ'34:3ab-4ab ; θ'34:6b-7ab ; θ'34:11b ; [p. XXX] θ'34:18b ; θ'34:23a ; θ'34:25b ; θ'34:28ab-29abc-30ab-31ab-32ab-33abc ; θ'35:7b-8ab-9ab-10a ; θ'35:12a ; θ'35:15ab-16ab ; θ'36:5b-6ab-7abc-8ab-9ab ; θ'36:10b-11abc ; [p. XXXI] θ'36:13ab ; θ'36:16abc ; θ'36:19c-20ab ; θ'36:21b ; θ'36:22a ; θ'36:24b-25a ; θ'36:26ab ; θ'36:27b-28a ; θ'36:29ab-30ab-31ab-32ab-33ab-37:1ab-2ab-3ab-4abc-5a ; θ'37:6b-7a ; θ'37:10a ; θ'37:11ab-12abc ; θ'37:13ab ; θ'37:18ab ; θ'37:21b ; θ'38:26ab-27ab ; [p. XXXII] θ'38:32ab ; θ'39:1a ; θ'39:3b-4abc ; θ'39:6b ; θ'39:8ab (Dans nos manuscrits suit une lacune qui va de 39:9b à 40:7b) ; θ'40:23b-24ab ; θ'40:26a ; θ'40:31b ; θ'41:4ab ; θ'41:8a ; θ'41:9ab ; θ'41:15b ; θ'41:18b ; θ'41:21a ; θ'41:24b ; θ'42:8e ; θ'42:16cd ; θ'42:17.

[p. XXXIII] De ce tableau il ressort que les stiques, qui manquent dans la présente édition de la version sahidique, avoisinent les trois-cent soixante¹⁶ ; mais si on y ajoute les seize stiques¹⁷ que nous supposons avoir figuré probablement dans la lacune de nos codex, parce qu'ils sont marqués d'un astérisque dans la version Syro-hexaplaire, on aura une somme peu différente de celle qu'a donnée Bickell¹⁸, dont le décompte est ainsi parfaitement confirmé. De ces stiques omis il n'y en a aucun, excepté seulement quatre, dont l'absence dans la vieille édition alexandrine ne soit confirmée par un signe origénien, soit par tous, soit par tel ou tel des autres témoins. De là, on peut considérer comme certain que les Soixante-dix traducteurs ont omis de traduire ces seuls stiques, qui manquent dans nos codex ^{a)} et qu'Origène dans ses Hexaples a restitués la plupart du temps d'après Théodotion. Mais l'omission des quatre stiques, dans le codex XXIV, à savoir G1:15b, G6:15a¹⁹, G15:19a, G33:15c-16a (en effet le stique 0'37:21b est omis même par Jérôme), semble devoir être attribuée non pas tant aux interprètes alexandrins qu'au scribe de ce même codex. En effet, comme il n'y a aucun doute à propos de G33:15c-16a — comme nous l'avons noté plus haut²⁰ — que le scribe a omis ces stiques parce qu'il a sauté du premier ϱωμε à l'autre par une erreur de lecture, qu'est-ce qui empêche d'attribuer l'omission des autres à la négligence de ce même scribe ? Or le fait que le copiste ait été réellement négligent se trouve confirmé ailleurs. En effet celui-ci, outre les stiques mentionnés, en a omis trois autres, à savoir :

¹⁶ Si l'on se fonde sur la disposition des stiques de J. Ziegler, le tableau de A. Ciasca comprend, d'après mon décompte, 370 stiques dont 364 astérisés ; mais J. Ziegler, p. 148, en a compté 362. Parmi les 370 stiques, 5 relèvent du texte court (1:15b, 6:15a, 15:19a, 33:15c, 33:16a) et 1 syntagme de la strate des réviseurs (2:1c). En G6:15a n'est omise par Sa qu'une partie de stique, et en 17:10a la partie omise, attribuée à Théodotion, est constituée de trois mots.

¹⁷ La lacune de la version sahidique (voir plus haut, n. 11) comprend, d'après l'édition de J. Ziegler, dix-sept stiques astérisés : 39:13a, 39:13b, 39:14a, 39:14b, 39:15a, 39:15b, 39:16a, 39:16b, 39:17a, 39:17b, 39:18a, 39:18b, 39:28 (monostique), 39:29b, 40:1 (monostique), 40:2a, 40:2b.

¹⁸ C'est-à-dire 373 stiques (voir plus haut p. XX). J. Ziegler, p. 151, a identifié quant à lui 389 stiques, auxquels s'ajoutent les trois mots de 17:10, ainsi que 42:8e qui est astérisé dans son lemme, mais qui n'a pas été rappelé dans la liste de la p. 151. Voir P. J. Gentry, *op. cit.*, 15, ainsi que 31, où P. J. Gentry donne sa propre liste du « Asterisked Material » relevant du premier apparat de J. Ziegler.

^{a)} [p. XXXIII] On peut douter à juste titre du stique 0'22b du chapitre XXX qu'on lit dans nos codex, alors qu'il est muni d'un astérisque dans la Syro-hexaplaire et dans les deux manuscrits de Jérôme.

¹⁹ Lire VI,15^a au lieu de IV,15^a.

²⁰ Voir plus haut, p. XXIX.

g16:20b-21a et g23:16b. Mais comme ils sont dans le codex XXXII et que le dernier l'est dans le Ms. IC, il est aisé de conclure que ces stiques n'étaient pas absents de la version sahidique, ni de l'édition alexandrine — d'autant plus qu'on les lit sans astérisque dans tous les codex hexaplaire. Donc, bien qu'on ne puisse pas prouver absolument que l'omission des trois stiques restants doive être attribuée à la maladresse d'un scribe — puisque, les autres manuscrits comportant une lacune, les termes de la comparaison manquent — on pourra cependant, par analogie avec les informations en notre possession, l'affirmer sans incongruité.

XII. Mais le fait qu'on ne puisse découvrir presque aucune trace de correction ^{b)} dans notre version — pour autant que cela apparaisse dans les principaux codex — ne doit pas du tout nous faire penser que ce genre de correction n'existait pas chez les Coptes, auxquels il a été toujours permis de porter la main à titre privé sur les livres saints. Certes on doit considérer les Coptes plus heureux que les autres peuples parce qu'ils ont conservé, dit-on, le texte sacré transmis par leurs ancêtres plus ou moins exempt de toute corruption, du moins dans certains livres ; cependant, si chez eux aussi [p. XXXIV] la corruption ne s'est pas généralisée, assurément ils en ont fait l'expérience. Le premier exemple en est la péricope du codex XXXII, dans lequel à la fin du verset 16 du chapitre 16 est ajouté θανάτου. Le mot est omis dans notre manuscrit XXIV et dans plusieurs copies grecques, mais il se trouve dans l'*Alexandrinus* et dans d'autres, ainsi que dans la Syro-hexaplaire avec un astérisque, desquels peut-être il a pu passer dans le codex mentionné précédemment. Mais là où le travail des correcteurs apparaît avec évidence c'est sans aucun doute dans le manuscrit de la *Bodleian Library* (Hunt. 5), dont Adolphe Erman a publié un fragment, noté D. En effet, la péricope du livre de Job qui est contenue dans ce volume (29:21-30:8) possède tous les stiques qui manquent complètement dans les deux manuscrits XXIV et IC, à savoir θ'29:24b-25, θ'30:1c.2-4a.7a. Cela montre qu'un savant, remarquant les fréquentes lacunes qui se rencontrent dans la version sahidique, et estimant peut-être qu'elles ont pour origine l'ignorance des scribes, a pensé qu'il était de son devoir de suppléer ces lacunes d'après des codex hexaplaire. On doit en outre se féliciter que la tentative de ce savant n'a pas été suivie par d'autres : autrement nous aurions été privés de ce très grand monument de l'Antiquité, grâce auquel l'ouvrage des Anciens, tenu en si grande estime d'abord par les juifs puis par les chrétiens, peut être apprécié comme il faut et rétabli dans son état ancien.

^{b)} [p. XXXIII] Je ne sais si la présence dans le codex XXIV du stique θ'30:20b, qui est omis dans le Ms. IC, et est lu, avec astérisque, dans la Syro-hexaplaire et dans les deux manuscrits de Jérôme, doit être considérée comme un début de correction.

XIII. En effet, plusieurs questions concernant l'authenticité de certaines leçons de la version alexandrine discutées par les savants peuvent être facilement résolues avec notre document. Ainsi, afin d'aborder quelques-unes seulement des questions soulevées par Bickell, étant donné que dans le texte originel on trouve une double traduction de 1:3, on s'est demandé si les deux ne devaient pas être attribuées aux Septante. Bickell pense que la première est originelle et que la seconde provient d'un autre traducteur. En fait comme les deux sont conservées en sahidique, il est tout à fait probable que et la première et la seconde soient originelles. On peut dire la même chose de la glose 6:7b ὥσπερ ὁσμήν λέοντος, attribuée communément à un copiste : de la même façon la version sahidique nous indique qu'on peut légitimement l'attribuer au texte originel de la Septante. Mais son silence témoigne du contraire à propos d'une autre glose qu'on lit à la fin du chapitre 11 [11:20c] dans la Syro-hexaplaire et l'*Alexandrinus* : παρ' αὐτῷ γὰρ σοφία καὶ δύναμις. [...] ²¹ Au contraire, μου qui est ajouté par la plupart des manuscrits à στολή en 9:31b est attesté comme originel par notre édition. Celle-ci en outre nous apprend pourquoi 9:15b est noté d'un astérisque dans le reste des témoins : en effet [p. XXXV] ce stique ne manquait pas dans la Septante ; ce qui est arrivé c'est qu'il a été déplacé du verset 14 — où on le lit dans la version sahidique — au verset 15.

On ne doit pas moins considérer cette édition comme apte à résoudre correctement les questions qui sont habituellement débattues par les critiques quant à l'authenticité d'une leçon. Et comme en 20:19a, à la place de la leçon commune δυνατῶν, la *Complutensis*, l'*Alexandrinus* et la Syro-hexaplaire lisent ἀδυνατῶν, certains pensent que la première est originelle, et que la seconde ne provient de rien d'autre que d'une correction ; mais le texte sahidique qui lit ἡσων = ἀδυνατῶν prouve que leur opinion est sans fondement. Pour la même raison on doit considérer comme vraie l'opinion de ceux qui affirment que la leçon ἐλέγξει σε en 22:4, dont témoignent la *Complutensis*, l'*Aldina*, l'*Alexandrinus*, la Syro-hexaplaire, Jérôme et d'autres manuscrits, doit être préférée à la leçon courante ἐλέγξεις. En outre les conjectures de certains critiques doivent être rejetées d'après la même version, comme celle qui est proposée par Schleusner ²² en 3:17a, qui affirme avec Bickell qu'à la leçon ἐξέκασαν = Sa τῆρε doit être substituée ἐπασσαν suivant le codex *Alexandrinus*, ou ἐξέπασσαν, afin que le texte de la Septante devienne conforme à

²¹ Je n'ai pas traduit quelques remarques similaires sur les variantes 2:13b (fin) πρὸς αὐτὸν λόγον, 7:10a ἔτι, 7:11bc τοῦ πνεύματος μου et τὸ στόμα μου, que J. Ziegler a rejetées dans son apparat critique I.

²² Schleusner (J. F.), *Novus thesaurus philologico-criticus*, Lipsiae, 1820-1821.

l'hébreu. Il y a une autre conjecture, presque du même genre, imaginée, à la suite de Grabe, par le même Bickell, en 9:24a où à la place de παραδέδονται γάρ il est proposé de lire παραδέδοται γῆ ; dans une conjecture du même genre, ils préfèrent lire en 4:10a στόνος à la place de σθένος, et en 13:28a ἴσα σῆς à la place de ἴσα ἀσκῶ.

Origène, comme nous l'avons noté plus haut, présenta parfois une double traduction du même passage : la première venait assurément du traducteur alexandrin, mais la seconde, qu'il marquait d'un astérisque, était choisie chez un autre parce qu'il la trouvait meilleure. Entraînés par cette façon de faire d'Origène, de très nombreux critiques, partout où il y avait une double traduction du même passage, en sont venus à attribuer aussitôt la seconde, marquée d'un astérisque, à Théodotion ou à un autre traducteur. Mais l'autorité de notre édition nous apprend combien il faut avancer prudemment dans ce domaine. En effet, en 9:3, les mots hébreux *lō' ya 'ānennū* présentent une double traduction dans les Hexaples ; la première οὐ μὴ ὑπακούσῃ αὐτῷ est couramment attribuée à Théodotion et à Symmaque ; la seconde ἵνα μὴ ἀντείπῃ, que Jérôme a rejetée, est attribuée au premier traducteur. Cependant comme l'une et l'autre leçon se trouvent dans la version sahidique, il est tout à fait probable que l'une et l'autre proviennent du premier traducteur ; et c'est pourquoi l'argument des critiques pourrait bien manquer de fondement dans ce passage. Mais ceux-ci ne se trompent pas du tout quand, en 30:1c, ils attribuent à Théodotion les mots ὧν ἐξουθενούν τοὺς πατέρας αὐτῶν et qu'ils disent que la leçon qui est juxtaposée [30:1d] οὓς οὐχ ἡγησάμην ἀξίους, seule reconnue par le texte sahidique, est originelle.

Enfin, pour ne pas m'éloigner de mon sujet, la question des stiques θ'28:21b-22a peut être parfaitement posée grâce à cette traduction. « Ici en effet — écrit à juste titre Bickell dans le passage cité²³ — en suivant l'autorité des meilleurs manuscrits et d'après [p. XXXVI] les caractéristiques de la traduction, c'est un fait établi que les mots καὶ ἀπὸ jusqu'à εἶπαν doivent être attribués à Théodotion²⁴. Sans doute y a-t-il des codex qui attribuent à cet auteur seulement le stique 21b ; mais il est prouvé que cela est une erreur, d'après le choix des mots d'une part, et d'autre part parce que le traducteur n'a pas pu mettre la particule δέ en début de phrase. » Néanmoins — puisque, avant Origène, Clément

²³ G. Bickell, *op. cit.*, 31.

²⁴ Jb 28:21ab-22ab : G λέληθεν πάντα ἄνθρωπον / ✠ καὶ ἀπὸ πετεινῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἐκρύβη. / ✠ ἡ ἀπώλεια καὶ ὁ θάνατος εἶπαν / G 'Ακηκόαμεν δὲ αὐτῆς τὸ κλέος. « Elle [la Sagesse] reste cachée à tout humain, / ✠ et est soustraite aux oiseaux du ciel. / ✠ La Perdition et la Mort dirent : / nous avons entendu parler de son renom. »

d'Alexandrie cite le passage mentionné en *Stromates* 6, 6, il est vrai en des termes un petit peu différents²⁵, — le même auteur soupçonne que ces stiques existaient dans la traduction alexandrine primitive ; mais qu'Origène, après avoir enlevé les deux stiques intermédiaires, a inséré à leur place la traduction plus exacte de Théodotion²⁶. Mais il est très clair d'après notre traduction — dont sont complètement absents les stiques en question — que ceux-ci ne furent pas traduits par le traducteur alexandrin ; c'est pourquoi il paraît assuré que Clément les a cités d'après une autre traduction. Mais ces stiques furent-ils insérés dans la Septante avant ou après Clément ? La question est discutée. Ils auraient pu en effet être lus par l'évêque d'Alexandrie soit dans la traduction ancienne soit dans celle de Théodotion lui-même. Si l'on soutient la première des deux hypothèses, il faut affirmer que déjà avant Clément la traduction des Septante avait été sujette à des corrections et à des modifications, comme beaucoup l'ont déjà soupçonné. Ce point établi, comme la version sahidique apparaît tout à fait exempte des corrections mentionnées, il est permis d'avancer qu'elle-même a été préparée d'après des codex antérieurs non seulement à Origène, mais aussi à Clément. L'extrême importance de ce fait pour la critique des Livres saints et pour l'évaluation correcte de la traduction des Septante, tout le monde assurément la voit.

XIV. Après cela, la question de la datation de notre version pourra être facilement résolue. En effet, si le traducteur copte a utilisé dans sa traduction du livre de Job des exemplaires grecs anté-origéniens, cela même nous indique assez que cette traduction a été achevée avant la diffusion des Hexaples. Qui en effet croirait que ce même homme, négligeant les codex hexaplaire alors qu'ils étaient déjà répandus, ait préféré faire cette version d'après des manuscrits anté-origéniens ? Cela apparaît d'autant moins crédible que peu après l'époque d'Origène, on trouvait à peine un ou deux livres — comme Jérôme nous l'apprend²⁷ — auxquels manquaient les signes critiques placés par Adamantius. On doit donc dire que la traduction du livre de Job a été publiée soit avant Origène, soit à l'époque où son ouvrage était conservé à Césarée, avant sa diffusion. En tout cas rien ne permet de penser qu'elle ait été écrite chez les

²⁵ Clément d'Alexandrie, *Stromates* VI, VI, 45, 1 : Διόπερ ὁ κύριος εὐηγγελίστατο καὶ τοὺς ἐν τοῖς ἐν "Αἰδου. Φησὶ γοῦν ἡ γραφή · Λέγει ὁ "Αἰδης τῇ ἀπωλείᾳ · εἶδος μὲν αὐτοῦ οὐκ εἶδομεν, φωνὴν δὲ αὐτοῦ ἠκούσαμεν, κ.τ.λ. « C'est bien pourquoi le Seigneur a également annoncé l'Evangile à ceux qui se trouvaient dans l'Hadès. L'écriture affirme donc : " L'Hadès dit à la Perdition : ' Son aspect, nous ne l'avons pas vu, mais sa voix, nous l'avons entendue ' ", etc. » (trad. de P. Descourtieux 1999, 151-153).

²⁶ A. Ciasca reproduit sans guillemets, à un mot près, la suite du texte de G. Bickell, *op. cit.*, 31.

²⁷ *Epistula* 112 (89), 19,2 ad Augustinum, citée par G. Bickell, *op. cit.*, 32, n. 42.

Coptes avant le reste des livres saints. C'est un fait — comme la nature de la chose le demande — les livres qui devaient être traduits avant les autres étaient ceux dont on avait un très grand usage pour propager la doctrine de la religion chrétienne et soutenir la piété des fidèles. De ce point de vue, personne ne peut douter que presque tous les livres du Nouveau Testament et certains livres aussi de l'Ancien l'emportent de loin sur le livre de Job. C'est pourquoi il faut penser que la version sahidique, surtout celle des Évangiles et celle des Psaumes [p. XXXVII], ont précédé de beaucoup la traduction de ce livre et c'est pourquoi l'opinion des savants qui, s'appuyant sur la tradition, affirment que la version copte a été achevée au moins à la fin du deuxième siècle doit être tenue pour vraie et authentique ^{a)}.

DOMINIQUE MANGIN

Membre associé du Centre Paul-Albert Février, UMR 7297,

Université d'Aix-Marseille, France

dmf.mangin@orange.fr

^{a)} [p. XXXVII] Voir, avant tous les autres, Lightfoot dans l'ouvrage *A plain Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament* etc. par Frederick Scrivener, Cambridge, 1883, 371, qui considère à ce propos : « De l'époque où les Écritures ont été traduites dans les deux principaux dialectes de l'Égypte aucun témoin direct n'a été conservé. Toutefois, si l'on en juge par analogie avec le latin, le syriaque et les autres anciennes versions, et compte tenu du cas d'espèce, nous sommes autorisés à supposer, sans risque de nous tromper, qu'aussitôt que l'Évangile a commencé à se répandre parmi les Égyptiens qui ne connaissaient pas le grec, le Nouveau Testament, ou en tout cas certaines de ses parties, a été traduit sans délai. Nous n'exagérons probablement pas si nous datons l'une ou les deux principales versions égyptiennes, la memphitique et la thébaine, ou au moins des parties de ces versions, d'avant la fin du second siècle. » Voir aussi Schwartz, *Quattuor Evangelia in dialecto linguae cop-ticae memphiticae*, etc., Lipsiae, 1846-47.

Dissertation Abstract

Different Literary Editions in 2 Sam 10-12. A Comparative Study of the Hebrew and Greek Textual Traditions

Author: Leonardo Pessoa da Silva Pinto.

Institution: Pontifical Biblical Institute, Rome.

Supervisor: Stephen Pisano. 2nd Reader: Craig Morrison.

Date defended: Nov 29, 2016.

This study discusses the possibility of different literary editions in MT and the OG of 2 Sam 10-12 by combining the traditional methods of textual criticism and the study of the narrative technique. When signs of a different edition were detected an estimation of the textual development was attempted.

In order to compare the narratives of the original Greek and MT, it was first necessary to reach the OG in 2 Sam 10-12, which can be obtained in our chapters only through the comparison between the Lucianic text and *καίτε*, and through the study of their respective translational or recensional features. In the section devoted to textual criticism the testimony of 4QSam^a and the witnesses to the Vetus Latina received much attention. The Targum, the Peshitta, Flavius Josephus and the Greek Chronicles were also taken into account.

Many differences between the OG and MT of 2 Sam 10-12 can have theological or ideological implications that deserve our attention. However, these variants cannot be grouped under a specific and consistent tendency in the OG or MT. On the other hand, many differences between the narratives of the OG and MT indicate that the story in the OG is clearer, less ambiguous than MT's. Logical steps are filled in and a more definite path of interpretation is given to the reader. The OG also displays an interest in making the narrative more similar to the accounts of Greek historians thus more easily identifiable to the Greek audience.

The above conclusions do not mean that MT's version is older in every respect in 2 Sam 10-12. This thesis has discussed instances where the OG is to be preferred. Furthermore, it was not always possible to decide whether it is the OG or MT that preserved the oldest reading.

This work also showed that reading the books of Samuel as a polyglot text is a fruitful exercise for biblical research.

Leonardo Pessoa

Pontifical Biblical Institute, Rome

leoteopessoa@yahoo.com.br

Book Reviews

IGNACIO CARBAJOSA y ANDRÉS GARCÍA SERRANO, eds, *Una Biblia a varias voces: Estudio textual de la Biblia Poliglota Complutense*. Studia bíblica matritensia 2, Madrid: Ediciones Universidad San Dámaso, 2014. Pp. 248. ISBN: 978 84 15027 56 0.

In 1514 the first volume (Vol. V, the NT) of the Complutensian Polyglot (henceforth: ComP) left the printing press, although it had to wait for years until papal approval came forth. A group of eminent specialists issued an exquisitely edited volume celebrating 500 years of this scholarly milestone.

The book offers a state-of-the-art introduction into the study of the Polyglot of Alcalá (Complutum in Latin). In a helpful and richly annotated format, it surveys scholarly literature about the Hebrew, LXX Greek, Aramaic, NT Greek and Latin texts of the polyglot, preceded by an introduction and a typographical treatment. The volume is directed at students and teachers, but also aims at a wider audience (able to read Latin quotes).

I. Carbajosa opens with “The ComP Bible 500 Years After: Lessons from a Great Editorial Project.” He places the project and its principles in its historical context, summarizes the layout of the Polyglot and draws parallels with current editorial projects. The ComP was ahead of its time in uniting the treasures of Eastern, Western and Syriac Christianity. The paradox of the Polyglot lies in the centrality of the Vulgate, which takes typographical and theological centre stage but yet is reduced to one of the witnesses alongside more original ones (MT, LXX). In the 1950s, plans for the Madrid Polyglot were conceived. This ambitious project never saw the light, but it did result in a renaissance of textual studies in Spain.

J. Martín Abad, “Cisneros and Brocar: A Typobibliographical Reading of the ComP,” describes how Cardinal Cisneros invited the printer Brocar to execute this monumental task, and introduces us to the layout, printing details and publication vicissitudes of the project.

Carbajosa describes “The Hebrew Text of the ComP” as a legacy of Sephardic Jewry. After the Expulsion (1492), Jewish converts played a key role in the ComP. The consonant text was printed with vowels but without Masoretic accents (except *sof pasuq* and *atnah*) or notes. The margin features roots of verbs and nouns referring to the dictionary at the end of vol. VI. Alignment between MT and the Vulgate was facilitated by superscript letters in alphabetic order. Equally essential to the didactic purpose of the ComP is the Hebrew grammar, closing vol. VI. The margin features roots of verbs

and nouns referring to the dictionary at the end of vol. VI. Alignment between MT and the Vulgate was facilitated by superscript letters in alphabetic order. Equally essential to the didactic purpose of the ComP is the Hebrew grammar, closing vol. VI. In recent decades, the three mss. underlying the Hebrew column have been identified. BH MSS 1 and BH MSS 2 are in the Biblioteca Histórica Marqués de Valdecilla, in the Universidad Complutense de Madrid, while codex G-I-5, containing only the hagiographa, rests in the monastery library of El Escorial.

N. Fernández Marcos, "The Greek Septuagint Text of the ComP," is mainly devoted to the mss. underlying it: Rahlfs 108 and 248, both from the Vatican Library, Rahlfs 68 from Venice, and two mss. that are originally from the Colegio San Ildefonso de Alcalá (founded by Cisneros) but now conserved in the library of the Universidad Complutense de Madrid, viz. 442 and 1670. In Ezekiel, the printed LXX text coincides remarkably with Papyrus 967. The ms. basis for the prophets awaits further study. Contrary to allegations, the editors produced an eclectic text but barely corrected or restored the Greek text on the basis of MT or Vulgate. In Jeremiah the shorter Greek text was printed alongside MT without attempts at harmonization. The article concludes by outlining six areas of further study (pp. 140-142).

L. Díez Merino underlines the Sephardic character of "The Aramaic Text in the ComP." The paper is somewhat enumerative regarding the editors of the Aramaic text and the manuscripts underlying it. Only Targum Onqelos was published in the Pentateuch volume. The rest of the targum for the OT was prepared in written draft, but deemed too paraphrastic to aid the understanding of Scripture. All the more interesting that a project has been launched to publish this valuable material.

According to M. V. Spottorno, "The Greek Text of the NT in the ComP" is superior to that of Erasmus. It was a pity that it appeared later, although printed earlier. The Greek text was printed without accents and was aligned with the Vulgate through alphabetic superscripts. The text was corrected towards the Vulgate in 1 John 5:7 only. The NT volume concludes with a lexicon of names and a Greek-Latin dictionary, the first NT lexicon appearing in print, which J.A.L. Lee considers of great value.

L. Vegas Montaner, "The Latin Versions in the ComP," depicts the deplorable state of the printed Vulgate editions, a situation which the editors of ComP sought to redress. After a sketch of the disputes surrounding the setup of the Vulgate column, Vegas describes the old and reliable mss. that its editors based their work on. These are the Biblias Latinas Complutenses 1, 2 and 3 from the library of the Universidad Central de Madrid. Variants were always culled from mss., but the variants closest to the source text were generally preferred. The paper includes a brief description of the (didactically literalistic) Latin versions of the LXX and Aramaic texts. A synopsis of Genesis 22 facilitates their comparison. MT was not translated afresh since the Vulgate was deemed to represent the *hebraica veritas*. The book closes with a bibliography and an index of persons and authors.

I commend this book wholeheartedly. Its value for LXX studies lies in its informed description of a key moment in the history of text editions, its elucidation of the text-

critical principles that guided the Polyglot editors, its nuanced evaluation of the text-critical value of the columns and their underlying mss. and the avenues for further study outlined in the chapter on the Septuagint.

THEO VAN DER LOUW
Emmeloord, Netherlands
theo_vanderlouw@sil.org

BENJAMIN G. WRIGHT III, *The Letter of Aristeas. 'Aristeas to Philocrates' or 'On the Translation of the Law of the Jews'*. Commentaries on Early Jewish Literature, Berlin – Boston: De Gruyter, 2015. Pp. 501. ISBN: 978-3-11-043134-6.

Infatigable investigateur de la Septante et du judaïsme hellénistique, B.G. Wright III nous offre un volumineux commentaire de la Lettre d'Aristée à Philocrate (= désormais LAr). On sait l'importance de ce texte pour éclairer les origines de la Septante, et combien a grandi l'intérêt à son égard, qui se traduit par une croissance sans précédent du nombre de publications. Reprendre l'ensemble des débats et en fournir une appréciation critique, l'ambition de l'entreprise est impressionnante. Le résultat ne l'est pas moins, car B.G. Wright III maîtrise admirablement son texte, ainsi que la littérature secondaire, y compris la plus ancienne et dans toutes les langues de l'érudition.

L'introduction comporte les parties suivantes : 1. L'état de la recherche et les buts du commentaire. 2. La valeur historique de LAr. Wright est d'avis qu'il faut se résigner à admettre que LAr ne contient aucune information valable sur les origines de la Septante. D'ailleurs elle présente la traduction comme visant à remplacer le texte hébreu alors que selon le modèle interlinéaire auquel adhère Wright, ce n'est pas le cas. 3. Le titre. 4. L'auteur et sa provenance. L'appeler Ἀριστᾶνος serait meilleur qu'Ἀριστέας, mais pour ne pas rompre avec la tradition Wright maintient "Pseudo-Aristeas". 5. La date. Les arguments de Bickerman, Hadas et des savants plus récents sont résumés avec toute la précision souhaitable, en faveur d'une fourchette entre 150 et 100 avant notre ère. La question des relations entre Aristobule et LAr est écartée parce qu'aucun des deux ne connaîtrait l'autre — cette conclusion, qui libère la datation de bien des hypothèses, me paraît difficilement soutenable si l'on croit que le récit de LAr est pure fantaisie, car il faut alors que la tradition commune à laquelle puisent LAr et Aristobule ait été bien ferme et bien détaillée, tout en restant seulement orale. 6. Critique textuelle. 7. Intégrité du texte et sources. Le Ps.-Aristée, plus artiste que plagiaire, insère les emprunts à ses sources avec liberté dans un ensemble organisé : il n'y a pas lieu d'y voir une compilation. 8. Genre, forme littéraire, structure. La question de savoir si LAr ressortit plutôt à l'historiographie ou au traité épistolaire donne lieu à une discussion très équilibrée, qui conclut au mélange des genres. Les quatre digressions ordinairement

reconnues se révèlent cohérentes avec le projet de l'œuvre, qui est de fournir un récit parallèle à celui de l'Exode. 9. Relation avec la littérature juive. Entre autres, il est fait justice des supposées similitudes avec le Pseudo-Phocylide. 10. Public et objectif visés.

Cette introduction est un morceau magnifique. Elle reprend les grands sujets avec quasi-exhaustivité, résume clairement et honnêtement les termes dans lesquels ils ont été traités par des auteurs plus anciens, et formule sur chacun un jugement net, en général plein d'équilibre.

Dans le commentaire, chaque péricope de la Lettre d'Aristée donne lieu à quatre parties : la traduction anglaise, des « Textual Notes », un « General Comment » et des « Notes ». Celui qui chercherait à lire la traduction seule aura du mal à en repérer les morceaux, car la mise en pages peu différenciée et le caractère d'imprimerie uniforme ne favorisent pas ce genre de lecture. Les « Textual Notes », concernent l'établissement du texte grec, et les « Notes », la façon de le comprendre et de le traduire. On ne remarque pas de répétitions entre ces deux parties. Cependant la distinction entre elles est peut-être trop subtile, puisque l'une et l'autre citent des mots grecs et recherchent le sens le plus probable du texte. Elles auraient pu être fondues ensemble.

Les « Notes » fournissent le commentaire historique du texte. Par exemple, p. 324-325, quelle est la victoire de Ptolémée sur Antigone évoquée en LAr 180 ? Ou p. 351-352, qui était Ménédème d'Érétrie et pour quelles raisons le Ps.-Aristée le fait-il intervenir ? D'autre part, prenant par la main l'étudiant helléniste désireux de lire la Lettre dans l'original, elles expliquent un grand nombre de mots. Ainsi p. 350 est discuté le sens de πῶς ἂν ἕκαστα πράττοι, ἁμαρτία, κατεπαίνεω, ἀνοχή, διάθεσις ; et même, p. 349, l'opportunité de traduire les répliques par un discours direct ou un discours rapporté ; p.108 sont recensés tous les sens que prend γράμμα dans la LAr, alors qu'à la vérité ils ne diffèrent guère de ce qu'ils sont ailleurs en grec. Était-il nécessaire de nous faire si familièrement entrer dans la cuisine du traducteur ? La plupart du temps il suffit de comparer la traduction de Wright avec une autre pour saisir non seulement leurs différences mais les raisons qui sous-tendent ces différences. A mon avis celui qui propose une traduction n'est pas tenu d'expliquer tous ses choix, ni de réfuter explicitement tous les autres. D'autre part, il ne faut pas encourager l'illusion selon laquelle le sens d'un mot dans LAr serait mieux éclairé par ses autres usages dans la littérature judéo- hellénistique que dans le reste de la littérature grecque. En hébreu, où la littérature conservée se limite à la Bible, y retracer l'usage d'un mot est un exercice presque toujours utile ; pour la Septante, si de nombreux usages propres à ce corpus méritent d'être étudiés, dans la majorité des cas l'éclairage viendra de textes non bibliques, et une liste exhaustive des occurrences dans la seule Bible grecque — tentation fréquente chez les “septantistes” — a peu d'utilité ; pour la *Lettre d'Aristée*, écrite en grec hellénistique courant, les exemples sont à prendre dans l'ensemble de la langue grecque, là où les dictionnaires ne suffisent pas tout simplement. Wright n'est certes pas dans l'illusion que je décris, mais ses listes d'occurrences me paraissent parfois céder à la tentation de l'information sans but précis. Et dans l'index des sources citées, la division établie entre les Pseudepigrapha, où figure LAr, les “Other Jewish

Writings” (Philon, Josèphe etc.) et les “Greek and Latin Sources” ne va pas dans le bon sens.

Ma réaction est semblable devant les « notes textuelles » : avec une grande précision, elles expliquent les points les plus importants de l’apparat critique des éditions. Elles nous font savoir où, sur la suggestion de quel savant on s’est écarté du texte des manuscrits, ou pourquoi en tel point Pelletier a préféré la leçon d’Eusèbe, etc. Elles disent donc en anglais clair ce que l’on peut lire ailleurs en latin codé. Cependant le lecteur non philologue, celui qui ne sait pas décoder le latin et les sigles d’un apparat critique, désire-t-il vraiment toutes ces informations ? Cette partie aurait pu être beaucoup plus concise.

Le « General Comment » combine tous les traits déjà observés. Parfois il s’attarde. Le plus souvent, il est excellent dans son exposé des problèmes soulevés par chaque péricope, sans jamais oublier de trancher et sans jamais perdre de vue le bon sens, de sorte que les jugements de Wright emportent l’adhésion.

Les relations entre le banquet et la littérature *Peri Basileias* font l’objet d’un excursus (p. 327-335 et 424-429). L’auteur compare les propositions de Zuntz et de Murray et prend parti pour Murray, à raison selon moi.

Dans un livre aussi foisonnant, rechercher un point précis peut se révéler difficile. Ainsi quant à savoir si le Ps.-Aristée connaît l’écriture paléo-hébraïque en plus de l’écriture araméenne carrée : la discussion du § 176 p. 323, non signalée par l’index (très riche pourtant) à « alphabet », ne renvoie pas à celle du § 98 (signalée), ni réciproquement, et ne décide pas si le Ps.-Aristée veut parler de paléo-hébreu ; à mon avis le § 98 permet de répondre par l’affirmative. A propos de Pharos, la fête annuelle de la Septante dont parle Philon est à peine mentionnée (p. 324 sur § 180), avec une attitude hyper-critique qui me paraît bien exagérée, puisque Wright envisage que Philon l’ait inventée à partir de sa lecture de L.Ar.

On peut ne pas tomber d’accord avec lui : ainsi je crois pour ma part que le Ps.-Aristée prétend être identique à Aristée l’Exégète (contra p. 19). Il me paraît tout à fait possible aussi qu’il ait vu Jérusalem de ses propres yeux (contra p. 195 avec Honigman). Mais sans aucun doute sur ces points et sur d’autres, la grande valeur des synthèses fait que les discussions prendront désormais pour base l’exposé de Wright.

Le livre est une somme, qui tient excellemment sa promesse d’exposer l’état de la science sur la *Lettre d’Aristée* en 2015. Il rendra les plus grands services à ceux qui s’y intéressent, depuis les débutants jusqu’aux chercheurs confirmés.

LAURENCE VIANÈS

Université Grenoble Alpes, U.F.R. LLASIC, B.P. 25

F- 38040 Grenoble, France

Laurence.Vianes@univ-grenoble-alpes.fr

RANDALL X. GAUTHIER, GIDEON E. KOTZÉ, AND GERT STEYN, eds., *Septuagint Sages, and Scripture: Studies in Honour of Johann Cook*. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 172, Leiden: Brill, 2016. Pp. xviii + 394; ISBN 9789004323827.

This volume is published in honor of the South African Old Testament and Septuagint scholar Johann Cook. Cook has written in a variety of areas, especially on Septuagint Proverbs, and has edited several major collections of essays in Old Testament studies. He has been honored with the presidency of the International Organization for the Study of the Old Testament (IOSOT), and has been highly active in Septuagint studies in various forms, and this volume appears at the end of his IOSOT presidency to honor his many accomplishments. The volume includes, as one might expect, essays on the Septuagint (Old Greek), but also on an array of other topics, most of them related in some way to the work of the honoree (especially Wisdom literature). Most of the contributors are from South Africa (12 of 20), with several other scholars of international standing brought in to complement the local talent.

In most collections of this sort, there is not only a wide variety of topics but a wide diversity in the nature and scope of the individual essays, and with it the quality and significance of the contribution of the individual chapters. This collection is no different, although even those that may not be the finest scholarship usually have something to add. One of the major contributions of this volume is its breaking out of the mold of the traditional book on Septuagint studies. Earlier books on the Septuagint often had a number of narrow studies, but this one extends the range significantly. There is plenty on the Septuagint here, to be sure, but there is much that crosses boundaries and does not hesitate to explore and re-explore both new and old topics.

An instance of a far-ranging essay is the first, by EVANGELIA G. DAFNI, “Isaak, die Tochter Jephthas und Iphigenie, Menschenopfer im Alten Testament und im alten Griechenland: Kulturkritische Beobachtungen unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Septuaginta” (pp. 1-30), which compares the sacrifice accounts of Isaac, Jephthah, and Euripides’s Iphigenia in *Iphigenia in Aulis*. Dafni shows how these ancient accounts relate to each other as part of a common ancient culture. ANNETTE EVANS writes on “Descartes’ Error and the Growth of Consciousness: A Non-Dualistic Reading of Genesis 1:1-7” (pp. 31-44). I found this a disappointing attempt to re-read Gen 1:1-7 from a supposed modern non-dualistic cognitive and developmental standpoint (Bertrand Russell is misspelled [Russel] all three times in the essay, as well as in the index). GIDEON R. KOTZÉ in “Greek Translations of Hebrew Left Dislocation Constructions in LXX Genesis” (pp. 45-65) identifies four ways “left dislocation” is rendered in LXX Genesis—reproduction, reproduction with changes to the dislocation, reproduction with changes to the matrix clause, and no reproduction—but pulls up short by not probing deeply into the semantics or pragmatics of the phenomenon. DIRK BÜCHNER in “A Commentary on Septuagint Leviticus 19:11-15” (pp. 66-83) offers a sample of his commentary for the NETS series. He attempts to place such a commentary within Translation Studies (thus more target and culture oriented), although his defense

of the NETS project, with its very narrow view of how the Septuagint functioned as an educational aid, is not convincing. The commentary itself remains word and phrase oriented, in that respect probably not much different from the kinds of translation approaches that he criticizes. JESSIE ROGERS explores the treatment of Sophia in “Where is Wisdom to be Found and How do We Apprehend Her?” (pp. 84-98). There seems to be some ambiguity in this study, and many such similar studies, whether this is a lexical study or a concept study of a personified notion. The sixth essay, by JAN JOOSTEN, concerns “The Relation of the Septuagint of Proverbs to the Septuagint of Psalms” (pp 99-107). This focused and interesting study examines a sampling of similar words and phrases to establish what appears to be the “priority” of Psalms over Proverbs as a translation.

RANDALL X. GAUTHIER provides probably the most language-intense essay in the volume, “Possessing Wisdom: A Study of the Possessive Pronouns and Adjectives in the Septuagint Version of Proverbs” (pp. 108-41). Gauthier provides a wealth of information on the use of pronouns and adjectives worth further consideration. Two major questions regarding the study, however, are why his linguistic framework primarily depends upon traditional grammar and hence a number of questionable assumptions about language (the dative is “more interpretive,” explanation of the article and possession), and whether the conclusions he draws sometimes reach beyond what the evidence can provide. In contrast to many of the other essays, KENNETH ATKINSON in “Septuagint Proverbs 28:4 and Shielding the Righteous: Implications for Understanding Sabbath Fighting in Josephus” (pp. 142-58) shows how the Septuagint can be used to clarify previous misunderstood interpretations within Judaism. This one is concerned with the notion of fighting on the Sabbath, where Atkinson shows that Prov 28:4 provides an explanation for it during the first Jewish war. HANS AUSLOOS in “‘A Man Shall Not Rise Again...’: Job 14:12 in Hebrew and Greek” (pp. 159-71) argues directly against the recipient of this Festschrift in claiming that in both the MT and LXX versions Job 14:12 may well suggest life after death—although I am skeptical that this passage is reflected in John 11:11 simply on the basis of some common vocabulary (the asterisked footnote that begins this chapter should have been deleted, and the first reference for Gerleman on p. 162 appears on p. 166). In an interesting literary investigation, MARKUS WITTE in “Jobs Sohn—Eine textgeschichtliche Notiz zu Job 42:17 (LXX)” (pp. 172-79) traces the literary origins of the names of Job’s sons found in the appendix to the book (LXX Job 42:17b-e), drawing on a range of biblical and extra-biblical sources. In “Old Greek Job 42—A Surprise at the End of the Road: Intertextual Connections between the Epilogue and the Prologue Introduced by the Translator” (pp. 180-89), CLAUDE COX shows, first by way of comparative translation and then by discussion of omissions and additions, how LXX Job goes well beyond the MT in restoring Job’s fortunes. I wonder, however, if Cox has missed the point of the major change in Job 42:7 in terms of how Eliphaz is addressed, as well as perhaps overstating the significance of other changes (e.g. the use of conjunctions). ARIE VAN DER KOOIJ writes on “Scholars and Officials in Early Judaism: The *Sôfer* of Jesus Ben

Sira" (pp. 190-204). He revisits the issue of whether the "scribe" (*sôfer*) in Ben Sira is a distinct class of people, a priest, or a lay person. After examining the evidence, he concludes that the person belongs to the "lay nobility" in Jerusalem.

The chapter by CYNTHIA L. MILLER-NAUDÉ and JACOBUS A. NAUDÉ on "The Metatextual Marginal Notes of Ben Sira: Ideology and Theology in the Geneva Bible (1560) and the King James Version (1611)" (pp. 205-58) is not only the longest in the book (including appendixes) but one of the most interesting. The authors explore an area of recent scholarly attention, metatextual commentary, and examine how the various types of commentary (cross-references, Greek notations, translation alternatives, cultural notations, and subheads) are used in two important English Bible translations of Ben Sira to shape readings of the text. I look forward to reading future studies by the authors on metacommentary (the two appendixes list all of the marginal notes in the two versions of Ben Sira). HARRY F. VAN ROOY in "Translating Wisdom in the Prophets: Ezekiel, Wisdom and Translation" (pp. 259-78) seems unfortunately to commit the classic confusion of word and concept. He purports to be doing a grammatical study when he ends up doing a conceptual study. There are no references to James Barr in this chapter (or anywhere else in the volume, if the index is to be believed). In "Enhanced and Revised: The Old Greek Edition of the Book of Daniel" (pp. 279-93), MARTIN RÖSEL provides what he terms a "history of reception" analysis of Daniel in its Old Greek forms to explain the origin of its later translation by Theodotion. Rösel's findings illustrate a number of theological developments in the later reception of Daniel. GERT STEYN in "Introductory Notes on Philo of Alexandria's 'Proverbs' and Idiomatic Expressions" (pp. 294-322) offers a major study of how Philo's proverbs relate to the Septuagint, known classical Greek authors, and unknown sources. His study encompasses both the forms of the proverbs and the introductory formulas, and he notes that most of Philo's proverbs can be attested in Greek classical authors, even if he uses them as a form of wisdom literature.

In one of the few essays that deals with the New Testament (see also Ausloos above), WOLFGANG KRAUS writes on "'Whom the Lord Loveth He Chasteneth': About the Adoption of Prov 3:11f. in Hebr 12:5f." (pp. 323-35). He interprets the use of Prov 3:11-12 in Heb 12:5-6 as a form of *paideia* or divine education involving suffering or chastisement. However, I was disappointed with his concluding hermeneutical assumptions and hermeneutical implications. These create a hermeneutical false dichotomy from which the author cannot recover (he may be reflecting a sensitivity heightened by Germany's past; cf. p. 324 n. 4). The final essay, by MICHAËL N. VAN DER MEER, is "Symmachus, the Septuagint and the Sages: An Examination of the References to Sumkhos ben Joseph in the Mishnah, Tosefta and Talmudim" (pp. 336-55). Van der Meer's essay argues that, because of wider access to electronic databases (although admittedly the information was previously available even if not used), a full study of the rabbinic references to Sumkhos can be made. This reveals to him that Sumkhos is not a widely used name especially in the early sources, and the same person may be both the second/third century translator Symmachus and the neglected rabbi

Sumkhos. Van der Meer's essay is a good example of the value of examining primary sources and not simply assuming the previous conclusions of others.

Professor Johann Cook should be pleased to have been honored with this collection of essays. Despite a few essays that perhaps are not as well-conceptualized as they might have been, there are many interesting and suggestive and even provocative chapters that reward reading and will be significant in future research. A list of the honoree's publications would have been welcome. There are unfortunately a healthy number of typographical errors, inconsistencies in language or format, and stylistic problems. The English used in essays probably by non-native English speakers (in particular van der Kooij, Rösel, and Kraus) is sometimes slightly off. Nevertheless, I commend the editors for compiling this collection, and the contributors for their efforts.

STANLEY E. PORTER
McMaster Divinity College
Hamilton, Ontario, Canada
princpl@mcmaster.ca

TAKAMITSU MURAOKA, *A Syntax of Septuagint Greek*, Leuven: Peeters, 2016. LXXIII + 904 pp.; ISBN 978-90-429-3316-3.

It may be appropriate to begin this review with a sort of truth-in-advertisement disclaimer. Back in the Middle Ages, while pursuing doctoral studies at the University of Manchester under F. F. Bruce and James Barr, I was fortunate to sit in several courses offered by a young lecturer named Takamitsu Muraoka, who had just completed his Ph.D. at the Hebrew University. (I have always thought it amusing that a Japanese scholar who had done his doctoral work in Israel was teaching Modern Hebrew, Qumran Aramaic, and Syriac to a Cuban-American in England.) Moreover, he unselfishly agreed to go over a draft of my thesis, and I benefited immensely from his detailed and valuable feedback. Readers thus will understand if this review does not appear to be totally unbiased.

During the following three decades—at Manchester, then Melbourne, and finally Leiden—Muraoka (hereafter M.) proceeded to make numerous and significant contributions to both Semitic and LXX studies. Since retiring from the Leiden chair, he has published, in addition to works on various Aramaic dialects, his full LXX lexicon (to my mind, an epochal achievement), an extensive two-way (Greek/Semitic) index to the LXX, and now, astonishingly, this comprehensive treatise on LXX syntax—the only full work of its kind in any language (and the vicarious fulfillment of Thackeray's life ambition).

Time and space constraints (to say nothing of this reviewer's limited capacities) rule out producing a thorough review such as this massive work deserves, and coming up with a long list of specific items that I found valuable does not seem the best use of this

opportunity. Even in the case of items that elicit questions or criticisms, one must be selective. What follows should therefore be viewed as a preliminary assessment, in the hopes that specialists will provide more authoritative critiques of specific topics.

I. *Plan*. Given the complexity and extensive character of Greek syntax, the first question that arises is how to organize the data. Volume 2 of the Schwyzler-Debrunner *Griechische Grammatik* covers the material under two major headings, *analytical* (to which almost 600 pages are devoted) and *synthetic* (fewer than 100 pages), an approach followed by others (e.g., E. Mayser's *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri*). M. has chosen a similar procedure, but using the headings *morphosyntax* and *syntax*; one should note, however, that in significant contrast to Schwyzler-Debrunner these two sections receive approximately the same amount of space.

In any case, M. describes *morphosyntax* as a division dealing with “functions and grammatical values of various parts of speech and inflectional categories”; *syntax* then has to do with how substantives and verbs are expanded, but also covers “macro-syntactic questions such as concord, coordination, word order and others” (p. XLII). Of course, no system is fully satisfactory; thus, for example, the morphosyntactical discussions often include instances where substantives or verbs are expanded (e.g., pp. 215 [prepositions], 344 [adnominal function of infinitive], 371 [articular participle]), and the overlapping categories lead to frequent repetitions. Fortunately, readers will not have any trouble finding what they want: in addition to a modest index of subjects, the author has provided an extremely detailed, twenty-six-page table of contents. I should mention also that M. has included a brief glossary of technical terms (though evidently he believes that readers will not need help with various somewhat arcane labels, such as *genus potius, consecutio temporum*, and σχῆμα καθ’ ὅλον καὶ μέρος; and I confess ignorance of how the latter rhetorical figure applies to the feature discussed on pp. 572-73).

II. *Use of scholarly resources*. The eighteen-page bibliography includes well over 500 items in a wide variety of modern languages (also Apollonius Dyscolus, Περὶ συντάξεως), and the reader quickly becomes aware that M. has carefully digested these works. We find constant references to the standard grammars of Classical and NT Greek (Kühner-Gerth, Wackernagel, Mayser, Abel, Schwyzler-Debrunner, Humbert, and Blass-Debrunner-Funk [Blass-Debrunner-Rehkopf]); mentioned with some frequency are Winer-Lünemann, Goodwin, Moulton-Howard-Turner, and Radermacher, but Robertson and Smyth, strangely, only about 10 times each). Of course, there is regular use of works devoted specifically to the Greek of the LXX, including the recent *Sintassi di greco biblico* by Pierri and Cignelli (two fascicles have appeared). On a personal note, I was delighted to see M.'s perceptive use of Otto Jespersen's *Philosophy of Grammar*, one of the truly enduring contributions to general linguistics.

In view of such an extensive bibliography, it seems almost uncivil to point out gaps. I will limit myself to a few comments that may be helpful to readers of this review. In 1992 the eminent classicist and linguist Francisco R. Adrados published his *Nueva*

sintaxis del griego antiguo, a kind of *magnum opus* that may be regarded as the synthesis of almost five decades of scholarly pursuits; in spite of certain idiosyncrasies in his work, attention to Adrados's perspectives and interpretations can prove highly instructive at various points. Two of A. Rijksbaron's articles are mentioned, but one misses his important work, *The Syntax and Semantics of the Verb in Classical Greek: An Introduction* (3rd ed., 2007); and Carl Conrad's perceptive, but unpublished, discussions of the Greek middle-passive (see his Web page, <https://pages.wustl.edu/cwconrad/ancient-greek-voice>) would have enhanced M.'s analysis of voice. It is appropriate to note also that, whether or not M. is familiar with contemporary advances, his discussions are largely innocent of the more technical developments in linguistics during the past few decades. The present reviewer does not necessarily lament this lacuna; aside from the fact that the field is in considerable flux (with not a few unresolved made this volume virtually inaccessible to most of the readers for whom it is intended. At any rate, anyone interested in seeing an application of, say, lexical-functional syntax or the so-called minimalist program to Ancient Greek should look elsewhere.

III. *Richness*. It is difficult to communicate the profound impression this volume makes to anyone who has not actually held it and spent at least a bit of time going over its pages. The format is large (29 cm., like M.'s *Lexicon*). Aside from its 73 pages of front matter and almost 90 pages of indexes, the body of the work runs to 813 pages. But even that information does not begin to convey the magnitude of the enterprise. I estimate that the index of LXX passages lists well over 8000 references (perhaps as much as one third of all the verses in the corpus!), with a large proportion of them appearing on more than one page. Moreover, most of these passages are actually quoted (not just referenced) and are followed by an English translation, a feature that even seasoned scholars will appreciate.

Most important, however, is the detailed arrangement and clear exposition of the material. Complex syntactical constructions are introduced with a carefully thought out description, followed by abundant examples and often accompanied by relevant comments. Much use is made of statistical information, at times presented in helpful charts; on pp. 17-18, for instance, a table tells us how many times the noun κόπιος occurs in the Pentateuch, the Psalms, and the whole corpus, classified according to grammatical case and whether the construction is articular or anarthrous.

The result is not, as some might fear, a chaotic sea of information, but rather a rich and accessible repository of linguistic data. Even spending only an hour or so on randomly chosen sections is an education. I might add in this connection that, especially considering the size and technical character of this work (and on a first printing to boot), one is taken aback by the remarkably small number of typos and other errors (for which the editorial staff at Peeters must no doubt receive some credit as well).

III. *Approach*. Readers of this review hardly need be reminded that what we call the Septuagint is characterized by a perplexing literary mixture. To begin with, it contains

not only translation documents (i.e., those that render a Semitic source) but also books written originally in Greek. So is it really feasible to write a book on syntax that includes both? Then, to further complicate matters, the texts of the translation books run the gamut from very “literal” or “mechanical” renderings to those that display elegant Greek style with nary a trace of their Semitic origins. In addition, some of the books display both characteristics. One is tempted to suggest, facetiously, that we need two separate works: one treating the texts that reflect Semitic influence and another one treating not only the documents written originally in Greek but also every passage in the translation documents that appears to be unaffected by the Hebrew/Aramaic source! Yet there are persuasive arguments, both practical and theoretical, in favor of treating together the whole corpus of Greek Jewish Scriptures.

Having decided on such an inclusive approach, M. is careful to keep the reader aware of differences between translation and nontranslation texts. Moreover, whenever the Greek appears (in his judgment) to reflect an underlying Semitic syntax, he consistently quotes the corresponding Hebrew/Aramaic text (normally using, however, a “broad” transcription that some readers may find a bit disconcerting). As if all that were not enough, M. is meticulous about pointing out relevant variants in the Greek textual tradition, including the so-called Antiochene text.

Nevertheless, there remains a crucial “philosophical” issue to be considered, namely, the perennial debate whether we should understand the Greek as the translator understood it (and thus intended it to be read) or as readers innocent of the Semitic source would have interpreted it. M. addresses this question directly and states: “We maintain that the two approaches in question, translator-centred and reader-centred, do not have to be mutually contradictory, but complementing each other” (XL). This statement might suggest that he intends to use both approaches in complementary fashion, but that does not seem to be a possible interpretation of his words. For instance, in a footnote he adds, “This same philosophy was maintained when we worked on our *Lexicon*,” a work where he explicitly contrasts his approach from that which seeks to understand the vocabulary of the LXX in relation to its Semitic *Vorlage* (this issue is addressed in my review of the *Lexicon*, published in *WTJ* 72 [2010] 435–38). Moreover, he goes on (pp. XL-XLI) to give an example of “the reader-centred” approach (2Esd 8:24, he believes, should not be understood as the Hebrew reads [contrast NETS]) but fails to give an example of the “translation-centred” approach.

Indeed, throughout the volume, when both options are possible, M. consistently (always?) chooses the former; it is possible that I missed some exceptions, but I do not recall one instance where he explicitly preferred the latter (unless we include such things as the “intensifier” use of anarthrous θεός [p. 16], but this is mainly a lexical issue and, besides, he makes no mention of Semitic influence at that point). Are we to infer that the value of the Semitic source should be accepted only in cases where no other sense is feasible? If so, what does it really mean that the two approaches should complement each other? Perhaps merely that M. is interested in determining how “the structure of the Semitic source languages may have influenced the selection of this or

that particular construction” (as the publisher’s blurb states)? (Cf. p. 49, where M., after quoting a large number of passages, says rightly: “All these nominative personal pronouns as a reflection of the underlying H[ebrew] construction are unmarked, devoid of any ‘emphatic’ value.”) Maybe all he means is that his own “reader-centred” approach complements the “translation-centred” approach of other scholars.

One specific example may help to clarify my concern. On p. 556 (in the course of dealing with the use of a noun or adjective as an adverbial adjunct), he quotes Isa 58:12, *οικοδομηθήσονται σου αἱ ἐρημοὶ αἰώνιοι*. In my translation for NETS, I took αἰώνιοι as modifying ἐρημοὶ and rendered the clause, “your ancient deserts shall be built” (the same analysis is adopted by Thomson, Brenton, Ottley, *La Biblia griega*, and *Septuaginta Deutsch*). By contrast, M. takes the adjective as adverbial and, supplying a noun (presumably οἰκίαι or the like), translates, “your deserts will be built as permanent (dwellings)” (cf. *La Bible d’Alexandrie*, “Et tes déserts seront bâtis éternels”). This intriguing way of taking the clause seems hardly obvious, but it is true, of course, that the construction article + noun + adjective normally signals a predicate use of the adjective, so a Greek-speaking reader/hearer perhaps could have understood the clause in such a way. But even if we agree that people ignorant of the Hebrew text might have interpreted the passage as M. suggests, we are still left with the question of how the Greek translator of Isaiah understood what he was writing *and thus how he expected his readers to understand the text*. The Hebrew is direct and simple enough (עולם הרבות, “ruins of old time” = “old ruins”) and could not have been understood the way that M. interprets the Greek. Moreover, there is little reason to think that the translator wished to communicate a different idea and deliberately modified the thrust of the passage; thus it seems most likely that the Greek construction, which yields a somewhat ambiguous sense, is due to influence from the Hebrew word order. If my comments are reasonable, should not a syntax of LXX Greek take into account this likely (if atypical) adnominal use of the adjective, while also indicating that a Greek reader may have understood things differently (as M. himself points out occasionally, e.g., p. 779 on Gen 7:10)?

IV. *Interpretation*. At the end of his introduction (p. XLVII), M. tells us that because syntax has “immense significance for interpretation and exegesis,” and because he wanted to show “how attention to syntax could deepen and widen one’s understanding of Septuagint texts,” he has frequently related technical details “to more down-to-earth exegesis.” Many readers will no doubt greatly appreciate this feature, just as they tend to make greater use of A. T. Robertson’s expansive “Large Grammar” than of the bare-bones BDF descriptions. Unfortunately, students (and not a few professional scholars), perhaps partly to justify the efforts they have expended learning Greek (or Hebrew), have a tendency to go overboard looking for significance in the grammar, and I fear that many of M.’s comments will encourage them in that endeavor.

(1) This potential problem crops up several times in the discussion of reflexive pronouns, which, admittedly, often express some emphasis. With regard to Gen 16:3, e.g., we are told that the use of “the reflexive ἐαυτῆς in lieu of the neutral αὐτῆς ... and

positioned before παιδίσκην underlines the sacrifice Sarah was making for her husband's sake" (p. 52). In Exod 21:7 ("someone should sell his own daughter"), "the depressive financial predicament in which someone is reduced to taking such a drastic step comes through with the use of ἑαυτοῦ" (p. 53). Very surprising is the comment that in Acts 24:24 the use of the adjective ἴδιος (which can serve as a rough synonym of the reflexive pronoun) "possibly underlines the highly objectionable mixing of public and private on the part of Felix" (p. 55n2). Elsewhere M. states that the genitive personal pronoun in Isa 63:16 stresses "the close bond between Isaiah's faith community and their God" (p. 475), and that the repetition and fronting of μου (plus the repetition of the emphatic ἐμοί) in Gen 4:23 brings to focus the "personal bond between Lamech and his two wives" (p. 477). There may be a modicum of truth in some of these suggestions, but in general they strike me as fostering overinterpretation.

(2) Similar questions arise in connection with M.'s treatment of verbal aspect (general observations on pp. 250-54, with specific details on pp. 292-306, but the issue comes up frequently in the intervening sections, pp. 254-91). The discussion will prove disappointing to many who have followed linguistic developments in this area during the past three decades. I do agree completely with M. when he states that past/nonpast temporal opposition is expressed morphologically in the indicative mood by the presence or absence of the augment (p. 250). However, most will consider it a regrettable step backward for him to identify (grammatical) aspect with *Aktionsart*, "action-type" (bottom of p. 252). Specialists in this field dispute a variety of details (including the precise relationship between aspect and *Aktionsart*), but there is almost complete agreement that one and the same particular type of action—i.e., the extralinguistic reality or "objective fact"—can be referred to by *either* the perfective or the imperfective aspect, depending on the ("subjective") viewpoint of the speaker. It therefore muddies the waters to suggest, for instance, that aoristic/perfective aspect indicates "momentary, punctiliar action" (p. 253) or "one-off" events (passim). (Cf. Adrados, *Nueva sintaxis*, 389-97.)

To be sure, there appears to be some confusion here (if not in the author's mind, then in this reviewer's understanding of what the author means). In a footnote (p. 252n6) M. explicitly contrasts his position with that of B. Comrie (who argues that "aspects are different ways of viewing the internal constituency of a situation"), yet he immediately goes on to describe as "important" and "illuminating" the distinction made by W. Brandenstein between *Aktionsart* as objective and aspect as subjective (a distinction that is totally consistent with Comrie's views). Adding to the confusion, M. elsewhere does acknowledge the disjunction between aspect and the nature of the event (see esp. p. 268). Indeed, M. is fully aware that the aorist can be used (and often is) of actions that are anything but momentary or one-off, as in Gen 5:22, which states that Enoch pleased (aor. εὐηρέστησεν) God for two hundred years (p. 297). Note also, for instance, that the verb μένω, which by definition indicates "durative" action, often occurs in the aorist (cf. esp. Gen 24:55, "Let the maiden remain [aor. μεινάτω] with us about ten days"). Conversely, a verb that would seem to refer to a "one-off" action can sometimes be

used with imperfective aspect (e.g., ἄπτομαι is used with aor. inf. in Gen 20:6 et al., but with pres. inf. in Lev 15:23 and 2 Macc 9:10).

There is no denying, of course, that some association exists between the nature of the extralinguistic action and the aspect that a speaker will choose to use (e.g., because the action of greeting is as a rule momentary in nature, ἀσπάζομαι normally occurs in perfective aspect); but the speaker may choose (consciously or not) to present the action in more than one way (as is well known, the cry “Crucify him!” is reported by Mark 15:13-14 with the aor. σταύρωσον, but the same action is expressed in Luke 23:21 with the pres. σταύρου). To put it differently: the type of action involved may influence a speaker to use one aspect over another one, but that is quite different from suggesting that the aspect itself indicates what type of action it is. Aoristic or perfective aspect simply views the action (whatever its type) as a whole or complete (not necessarily *completed*, since this term introduces a temporal element); imperfective aspect views the action as in progress, even in cases where the action may already have been completed. One must add, however, that aspectual choices are usually intuitive (even subconscious?) and/or constrained by some factor or another, and that therefore we should refrain from reading too much into such choices, as though the writer/speaker is deliberately wishing to highlight a point. (In English, do we normally intend to emphasize something when we use the imperfect rather than the preterit or vice versa? We just do it pretty much automatically.)

A few specifics may be helpful. When dealing with the present indicative, M. includes “customary, habitual” as one of its uses (p. 259), but in all the examples he gives such a function is rather expressed by other items in the context (καθ’ ἡμέραν in 1 Macc 6:57; ἀδιαλείπτως in 12:11; αἰεί in Ps 94:10; ἡμέρα καὶ νύκτα in Neh 1:6); if the writers did not want to refer to the past or the future, what other choice did they have but to use the present tense? Here and frequently throughout this volume—as well as in most other works that deal with these issues—statements are made without considering that it may rather be the context, linguistic or otherwise, that is contributing to the meaning being posited for the syntactical feature under discussion. (I return to this issue below on the genitive case. See further p. 241, e.g., which deals with “self-propelling action” expressed by the middle when in fact that feature appears to be communicated by the meaning of the verb itself, such as φέρω, κινέω, etc.) Again, we read that the present φαίνειν in Gen 1:15 indicates “a permanent cosmic order,” that the aorist ἐμπαῖζαι in 39:17 refers to “a specific incident” (p. 293), and that the present οἰκεῖ in 35:1 “denotes permanent residence, whilst the two juxtaposed imperatives, both in the aor., express one-off actions” (p. 294). (Are the ten years that Abraham lived in Canaan, expressed with the aor. οἰκῆσαι in 16:3, not to be considered permanent residence? Cf. also 29:19; Jdg 11:26B; Jer 47:10. Like μένω and quite a few other verbs, οἰκέω normally occurs in imperfective aspect [one is tempted to call it the “default” usage for this verb], so its occurrence over against the perfective is unlikely to carry any special significance.)

In the process of formulating aspectual distinctions, grammarians and commentators do not in general take counterevidence into account, except to point out that there are exceptions. The truth of the matter is that for almost every claim that has been made concerning significant semantic values in aspectual uses, one can easily find a substantial number of instances that appear to contradict it, which leads to the routine qualifications (“one should not expect the language to be perfectly logical,” etc.—obvious, but not too helpful in understanding the phenomenon). Of course, the problem of how to deal with exceptions is not limited to the area of verbal aspect. Time and time again throughout the whole volume, M. makes such comments as “flexibility in this matter” (p. 11), “there is no rigidity here” (p. 14), “inexplicable” (p. 17), “the line ... becoming blurred” (p. 76), etc. And with regard to aspectual choices he tells us, for example, that “it is not apparent why ἀριστᾶν, and not ἀριστῆσαι,” is used in Gen 43:25 (p. 273), that the usage in Isa 40:3 is “baffling” (p. 295), that in the case of “fear-related lexemes” we should not press aspectual opposition “too far” (p. 296), that there is “some degree of uncertainty and ambiguity” in the distinctions (p. 298), and so on. This honesty is commendable, but the divergences are so many that they need to be taken more seriously when identifying patterns. All of this, however, is not to say that the syntactical rules delineated here (or in any other grammar) are necessarily invalid or that they have no value; only that there is much work to be done refining the material.

(3) In this connection we should consider, lastly, an issue of a somewhat different character: the classification of case functions, especially those of the genitive (though the principles are relevant more generally). Some have suggested, tongue-in-cheek, that grammarians are involved in a competition to see who can come up with the largest number of labels (on p. 145n1 M. mentions “a list of 30 kinds of genitive in Latin ... and the list is said to be far from complete”). There is no doubt some pedagogical and organizational value to the practice of cataloguing the various meanings that result when a noun in the genitive depends on another noun. The problem, however, is that grammarians leave the impression (and often state explicitly) that these meanings are functions expressed by the grammatical case itself.

At the risk of sounding reductionistic or even simplistic, we may say that these adnominal genitives have *only one* function, namely, signaling that there is some kind of relationship between the two nouns; what that relationship may be is communicated not by the syntax but by the context (including everything from the immediate linguistic elements to the speaker’s knowledge at its broadest). Indeed, there is perhaps no substantial difference between these adnominal genitives and the prenominal modifiers that are so common in English (in phrases like *book sale* [corresponding to “objective genitive”], *garage sale* [“genitive of place”], *spring sale* [“genitive of time”], etc., the syntax tells us only that the two nouns are related; we know what the nature of the relationship is between the two nouns not because of the grammar but because of our general knowledge).

Thus it seems misleading to suggest, for instance, that “time-span” is a function of the genitive when the examples given show that the temporal element is communicated

not by the genitive but by the context, in the form of the lexemes ἡμέρα and μῆν (pp. 150-51; because of the tendency to attribute to the genitive the semantics of the nouns involved, Adrados quips that ἡ χεὶρ τοῦ νεκροῦ could be called a cadaveric genitive [*Nueva sintaxis*, 14]). Again, we happen to know that circumcision results in blood, but is it legitimate to suggest that in the phrase τὸ αἷμα τῆς περιτομῆς (meaning simply “circumcision blood”) the genitive expresses cause (p. 158)? One wonders whether these and other examples may have been influenced by how the Greek syntagms are (or can be) translated into English (or other modern languages) to make the meaning clearer. One is reminded of A. T. Robertson’s frequent complaints about trying to elucidate Greek from the English standpoint. (Note, e.g., his *Grammar*, p. 388: “Indeed how a Greek idiom is to be represented in English is a matter of little concern to the Greek grammarian till the work of translation is reached. The Greek point of view is to be observed all through the process till translation comes. It is Greek syntax, not English.” Of course, Robertson was not invulnerable to falling into this very trap—and the same goes for the rest of us.) In other respects, however, M.’s discussion of the cases is most valuable; to mention but one example, note on p. 22 a large number of pairs of passages, one member of the pair showing the use of the “synthetic” genitive and the other showing the corresponding and equivalent use of a prepositional phrase.

V. *Closing comments.* The remarks above have been very selective. In fact, my copy of M.’s *Syntax* now has hundreds of pencil markings that reflect disagreement or uncertainty (though I have no doubt that the number would be reduced drastically if I had the opportunity to interact with the author on the relevant points or to research them in detail). However, neither those markings nor the cavils mentioned in this review paint a reliable picture of the value of M.’s work. Indeed, the positive qualities that characterize this volume overwhelm any potential weaknesses that one may detect. The thoroughness of the research, the comprehensiveness of the data, the care with which the material has been brought together, the clarity of the presentation, and the acumen of the analysis mark this *Syntax* as a prodigious contribution to the study of Ancient Greek in general and of Biblical Greek in particular.

If this volume had been produced by someone who had, during a long career, held a chair in the classical languages and published numerous preparatory articles and monographs on Greek syntax and related topics, one would have to regard it as an extraordinary *magnum opus*. But considering that Professor Muraoka has devoted the bulk of his career to the study of a very different language group, the achievement can only be described as stunning. We are all deeply in his debt for his industry. And warm thanks are due also to Peeters Publishers for their part in producing such a handsome and high-quality tome.

MOISÈS SILVA

Litchfield, Michigan

unclemose@chartermi.net

JOHN SCRENOCK, *Traductor Scriptor: The Old Greek Translation of Exodus 1–14 as Scribal Activity*. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 174. Leiden: Brill, 2017, xvi + 214 pp.; ISBN 978-90-04-33620-9.

This monograph is a revised version of the University of Toronto doctoral dissertation of John Screnock, Kennicott Fellow in Hebrew at the University of Oxford. The main question the book addresses is the degree that evidence from the Old Greek translation (OG) of the Hebrew Bible (HB) can be used in textual criticism of the HB. Screnock desires to move scholars in the direction of a fuller use of the OG to reconstruct the history of the Hebrew text by shifting them away from notions such as: (1) an OG reading should not be considered in the textual criticism of the HB when no existing Hebrew manuscript has the same reading, and (2) it should be presumed the OG is translating the MT if it is a possible source. He develops his argument in four main chapters and a conclusion, and the question that frames the development of the book is the extent to which the translators of the OG operated in the same manner as the scribes who transmitted the text of the HB (thus the title *Traductor Scriptor*). His central thesis is that the transmission of Hebrew manuscripts and the translation that occurs in the OG are fundamentally similar processes, and therefore we find the same types of changes in the HB and the OG manuscripts.

In chapter one Screnock lays his “Methodological Foundations.” He begins with a helpful overview of six different approaches to the history of the development of the text of the HB, and he favors Eugene Ulrich’s work because Ulrich focuses on a book-by-book description of the process and he shows the similarity between text production and text transmission. In this regard Screnock argues for an overlap of textual and literary criticism and proposes that both scribe and translator engaged in preservation of the source text and the production of new material; he also emphasizes the role of orality and memory in the textual transmission, and he explains that the main categories he uses for the data in Hebrew manuscripts and the OG are: scribal error, linguistic-variant, sense variant (and translation technique in OG). A somewhat controversial aspect of Screnock’s method is his typology of OG translation; here he follows Pietersma in focusing “on the production of the OG, not its reception, when considering the translation profile of the OG,” and thus “the meanings of Greek words and the meaning of the text for later audiences—should not enter our consideration (unless it somehow informs us about the production of the text)” (p. 26; see also p. 73). Consistent with this typology he defines translation technique as the “linguistic relationship” between the translation and “the translator’s understanding of its Vorlage” (p. 27). The OG is a “source oriented” translation that “caters more to the source language and brings the audience to the text” and “wants to preserve the linguistic structures of the source language” (pp. 27–28). The basic strategy of a source oriented translation is “isomorphism ... the attempt to mirror the parent text exactly in morphology, syntax, and lexicon” (p. 28), and with this understanding “the OG’s goal is to bring the Hebrew text into Greek with as little interference as possible, giving the audience access to the

Vorlage" (p. 30). Screnock acknowledges that target oriented translation is found in the OG and that the method he develops is not suited for those texts, but he feels much of the translation in the OG is best characterized as isomorphic (source oriented). In chapter one he also discusses the five possible causes of difference between the OG and Hebrew manuscripts that he uses as his rubric, he reviews the literature on OG Exodus, and he defines his corpus of study as Exodus 1–14.

In chapter two Screnock delves into "The Overlap of Transmission and Translation." Here he builds the case that scribal transmission and translation involve the same process, which model will be the basis for his comparison of OG translation and HB transmission in chapter three. He develops his argument by arguing that scribal transmission involves the same process as intralingual translation (restating the language of a text in the same language to make it more understandable), intralingual translation and interlingual translation (translating a text into another language) are two expressions of the same phenomenon, and thus the variation in texts found in their transmission is very similar to the variation found in intralingual translation of texts and the variation in HB manuscripts and in their translation is similar. It should be emphasized that Screnock is working primarily at the linguistic level in these comparisons, and he is not trying to account for reasons for changes (p. 63). Isomorphism, based on source oriented translation, is important for his approach; it is what connects the source text and the target text and provides for the preservation of the source text, but it can also not be successful and result in linguistic change. When the OG translator translates isomorphically "the OG is essentially transmitting the text of its *Vorlage*, in much the same way that a Hebrew manuscript would" (p. 76). Screnock argues further for an intermediate stage between the manuscripts in the translation process: he maintains that in the translation process the translator creates a mental text in his mind of first the source text and then the target text, and that many of the differences between the Hebrew and OG were created by the translator in his mind in the mental texts, especially the Hebrew mental text; these differences were never written in a Hebrew manuscript, but they would reflect the translator's understanding of the Hebrew text and thus have value for textual criticism of the Hebrew. Screnock's argument here is not totally convincing, especially his response to James Barr, who argued that the translator need not have a fully vocalized Hebrew text before he moved to the semantic content of the Hebrew and then to the receptor language. One might wonder if the translator's focus would have been more on the Greek rendering he had to produce than on the vocalization of the Hebrew. However, this is an issue that deserves more scholarly attention, and Screnock has provided much to ponder concerning the role of mental texts.

Building on the arguments for the overlap of transmission and translation and the mental text stage that were developed in chapter two, in chapter three Screnock compares the small scale variants in Exodus 1 that arise in the process of translation into Greek and in the process of transmission in Hebrew. He categorizes the variants as scribal error, linguistic variant, and sense variant (and translation technique in OG,

where the text in the translator's mind does not disagree with the Hebrew manuscripts though the method of translation [typically isomorphic] results in a Greek text that differs from the Hebrew). Then he compares "the types of variant found in each process, their quantity, and their distribution among various subcategories" (p. 93). The textual analysis in this chapter is excellent, and it contains many valuable insights; in his analysis of the Hebrew text Screnock interacts with the Samaritan Pentateuch, the MT, and the evidence from Qumran. The data from Screnock's comparison of differences from the Hebrew in the OG "is within the acceptable or expected range and manner of how the Hebrew manuscripts themselves differ among one another" in frequency, main types of variation, and even in specific subcategories (p. 148), supporting the hypothesis that with respect to individual variants, the translation in the OG is fundamentally similar to the transmission in the preserved Hebrew manuscripts.

Chapter four is entitled "Large-Scale Variation in the Old Greek Translation and Hebrew Manuscript Transmission in Exodus 1–14." Following Ulrich's analysis that there are five editions of Exodus available in the extant evidence, Screnock employs Ulrich's third edition (found in 4QpaleoExod^m, 4QExodLev^f, and the Samaritan Pentateuch) as the basis of his comparison with the OG of Exodus 1–14. (The first edition is the OG, and the second edition is based on material in chapters 35–39, so neither is useful for this comparison.) The Hebrew manuscripts have several lengthy insertions, which almost always involve the pairing of commands and their fulfillment, but there are no large scale variations in the OG. Screnock concludes that "the OG is not merely as faithful to its parent text as the Hebrew manuscripts, it is actually more faithful" and with respect to accuracy "the process of translation surpasses the process of transmission in this corpus" (p. 173).

Thus, Screnock concludes that if the basic aspects of translation from Hebrew to Greek are excluded, scribes and OG translators "do the same things with the text, to the same extent and for the same reason" (p. 175). Therefore when the Greek represents the Hebrew isomorphically, differences between the OG and HB just as likely derive from the scribe's work in the *Vorlage* as they do from the translator. Furthermore, since it is impossible to determine if the variant reading was in the *Vorlage* of the OG or only existed in the mind of the translator, Screnock suggests that in such cases we use the Hebrew represented in the OG for textual criticism. He gives several arguments in support of this last suggestion (pp. 180–183), but not all will be convinced that the Hebrew represented in the OG should be used so liberally in textual criticism. As with Screnock's overall methodology, it is the same with the concept of a mental text; it only works with an isomorphic, source oriented translation, and several parts of the OG are much less isomorphic and source oriented than Exodus 1–14 (see p. 179, n. 2).

The book contains eighteen figures, two appendices, and two indices to help the reader. It is well written with especially helpful introductions and conclusions throughout. It is a book that everyone involved in textual studies in the HB and the OG should read, as well as those who study translation technique of the OG and translation more generally. After reading this work I am more convinced than ever that those who

work with translation technique in the OG need to be informed in text-critical issues concerning the HB, and I am also convinced that those who work with text-critical issues in the HB as related to the OG need to be aware of studies of the translation technique of the OG. In *Traductor Scriptor* John Screnock gives scholars much to consider with regard to textual-critical issues in the HB, especially concerning the evidence from the OG in isomorphic, source oriented translations. May the discussion continue and broaden to include also the evidence from the OG in more target oriented translations.

W. EDWARD GLENNY
University of Northwestern
St. Paul, MN, USA
eglenney@unwsp.edu

Anne-Françoise Loiseau, *L'influence de l'araméen sur les traducteurs de la LXX principalement, sur les traducteurs grecs postérieurs, ainsi que sur les scribes de la Vorlage de la LXX*. Septuagint and Cognate Studies, 65, Atlanta, SBL Press, 2016. 216 pp.; ISBN 9781628371567.

Le besoin se faisait sentir d'une étude approfondie et aussi systématique que possible des indices matériels prouvant l'influence qu'a pu avoir la langue araméenne sur les choix de traduction dans le grec de la Septante de nombreux termes hébraïques de la Bible. Des études ponctuelles avaient pu relever que des termes hébraïques étaient compris par les traducteurs grecs par le biais de l'araméen, en l'absence de toute indication de vocalisation du texte hébraïque (à l'exception des matres lectionis) et lorsque le contexte s'y prêtait.

Jan Joosten rappelait, dans une contribution parue en 2008, des termes araméens transcrits en grec, tels γειώρας/γιώρας (Ex 12,19; Is 41,1), qui reflète l'araméen *giyyôrā'*; παταχρα/παταχρον (Is 8,21; 37,38), qui transcrit *pətakrā'*; γάζα et bien d'autres, qui avaient été recensés précédemment, en 1973, par Peter Walters. Il avait été relevé également que d'autres mots communs à l'araméen et à l'hébreu sont transcrits dans la Septante d'après la forme emphatique de l'araméen, tels πασχα, σαββατα, σκερα, μαννα... Par ailleurs, des noms propres sémitiques transcrits en caractères grecs semblent refléter la forme araméenne plutôt qu'une vocalisation hébraïque, ainsi les noms théophores comportant le théonyme *b 'l-*, rendu en grec par Βεελ-, reflétant l'état construit araméen *bə'ēl*.

Le livre de l'A. vient ainsi s'ajouter à des études plus ponctuelles, en livrant une analyse minutieuse et érudite de nombreux passages bibliques, dont on se demande si l'ordonnancement suit une logique mise au point au fur et à mesure de leur accumulation ou s'il est mis en place a posteriori, en systématisant des situations récurrentes.

L'A. a raison de vouloir distinguer entre ces deux catégories: d'un côté le conditionnement des traducteurs grecs par les rapprochements qui peuvent être faits spontanément entre l'hébreu et l'araméen; d'autre part, les traditions exégétiques ayant pu influencer aussi bien les traducteurs de la Septante que les versions araméennes plus tardives. Pour rendre compte de la première de ces deux possibilités – qui est aussi celle qui vient le plus naturellement à l'esprit –, l'A. sélectionne des exemples.

Utilement, l'A. relève de nouveaux cas ou rappelle des exemples déjà discutés, où la traduction grecque sous-entend une signification que peut imposer plus promptement à l'esprit du traducteur un mot araméen, également attesté en hébreu, bien qu'avec un sens qui diffère. Ainsi le pluriel hébraïque *šîrôt*, en Am 8,3, a été compris par le traducteur non comme « chants » (pluriel pour *šîrāh*), mais comme « lambris » (φαινώματα), d'après l'araméen *šaryātā* ' « poutres », « charpente » (p. 24-26). Il n'est toutefois pas exclu que l'aramaïsme ait pu exister déjà dans la langue hébraïque. Cela vaut pour bien d'autres cas, comme l'A. elle-même n'omet pas de le souligner à plusieurs reprises (un des exemples que l'A. donne est Is 66,9, p. 81). L'araméen, omniprésent à l'époque perse, a pu s'insinuer dans le vocabulaire hébraïque, notamment lorsque des termes spécialisés faisaient défaut. La Septante peut, dans des cas comme celui-ci, révéler aux lexicographes de nouveaux aramaïsmes en hébreu, que les dictionnaires ignorent.

L'A. pointe avec raison le cas de traductions en grec de mots hébraïques rares par le biais de l'araméen. Ce type d'exemples requiert des explications complexes du fait même de la rareté de ces mots. L'A. choisit le mot *zîz*, qui est un tris ou plutôt dis legomenon biblique (des trois occurrences, deux sont identiques: Ps 50 [49],11 et 80,14), et pour lequel les lexicographes ont suggéré un rapprochement avec l'akkadien *zāzu* (« morceler », « diviser », d'où *zûz*, le demi-sheqel). Le contexte des deux occurrences des Psaumes a permis au traducteur de la Septante de rendre ad sensum l'expression *zîz sādāy*, par « bête (ou sanglier) sauvage » (μὲντις ἄγριος, 80, 14) ou encore par « produits de saison du champ » (ὠραιότης ἀγροῦ, 49,11). Le même mot en Is 66,11, occurrence qu'analyse l'A. (p. 40), est en revanche compris comme εἴσοδος, « entrée », alors que le contexte d'origine fait penser à une signification « trayon » – selon l'A., qui préfère la métaphore animale – ou, plutôt, « mamelon », si l'on considère que la métaphore dépeint Jérusalem sous les traits d'une mère nourricière plutôt que d'une vache allaitante. L'A. interprète dans ce cas εἴσοδος comme un terme architectural, qu'elle traduit « vestibule », en s'appuyant sur un sens « entrée » du terme araméen *zîzā* ' qui désigne plutôt une moulure, une corniche. Il serait plus simple de se référer au terme tout à fait hébraïque *māzûzāh*, qui est le montant d'une porte ou sa moulure (1 S 19, Ez 41,21...), pris par le traducteur *pars pro toto*, comme « entrée ».

Certains des chercheurs qui se sont penchés sur les raisons qui ont pu déterminer les traducteurs dans leur choix avaient déjà souligné de curieux rapprochements entre la traduction grecque de la Septante et les Targums araméens ou la Peshitta syriaque. La question s'était posée de savoir si ces versions araméennes, sans conteste postérieures de plusieurs siècles à la Septante, reposaient sur des traditions araméennes (écrites ou

orales) ou si ces coïncidences n'étaient que le fruit d'une démarche analogue de traduction, reflétant une même compréhension des mots hébraïques par le biais de l'araméen.

Comme judicieusement l'explique l'A. dans la partie introductive, l'influence de la langue araméenne sur les traducteurs grecs n'est pas celle des Targums, quand bien même des coïncidences pourraient ponctuellement le laisser penser, pas plus que les rapprochements que l'on peut faire entre les choix lexicaux des traducteurs grecs de la Septante et la langue syriaque ne peuvent impliquer la Peshitta – une traduction qui voit le jour près de quatre siècles après les premières traductions de la Septante. Invoquer encore une « influence du syriaque » sur le grec de la Septante (p. 5) pêche par anachronisme, puisqu'on ne peut envisager l'existence du syriaque tel quel, ou du dialecte araméen de la région d'Édesse, avant ses premières manifestations écrites, au premier siècle de l'ère chrétienne.

Lorsque les lectures des Targums coïncident avec celles sous-entendues par les mots de la Septante, il est tout naturel d'invoquer la compréhension de l'hébreu par le biais de l'araméen, mais lorsque les choix de la Septante diffèrent de ceux des Targums, maintenir la thèse du truchement araméen appelle d'autres types d'explications. Consciente de la difficulté qu'il y a à interpréter les coïncidences entre le vocabulaire de la Peshitta ou des Targums et les choix de traduction dans la Septante comme une influence sur celle-ci de ces versions – de beaucoup postérieures –, l'A. a recours à ce qu'elle désigne comme des « traditions d'équivalences hébreu-araméen ou des “proto-targumim” » (p. 74), ou encore des « listes d'équivalences hébreu-araméen » (p. 79). Il fallait d'autant plus situer en amont des Targums ces coïncidences entre le grec de la Septante et un certain vocabulaire araméen, que, très souvent, les choix mêmes des Targums ne sont pas ceux, araméens, que laissent supposer les mots grecs.

Certaines démonstrations requièrent une grande concentration de la part du lecteur. Ainsi en va-t-il pour Ez 21,14 (p. 84), où les écarts entre le grec et l'hébreu semblent dus, du moins en partie, à la difficulté du texte hébraïque. Un des mots clés de ce passage est le participe passif qal, *mārūtāh*, « lustrée », « étincelante » (en parlant d'une épée), doublé, au verset 15 et 16, du pu'al du même verbe, *mōrātāh* ou de l'infinitif qal, *mārāh*. L'A suggère encore une fois le recours – qui aurait été implicite, sous-entendu – à un équivalent mishnique et araméen de même sens, *ṣāhab*, « étinceler », « prendre une couleur jaune-doré », au figuré, « être jaloux, courroucé ». Ce serait précisément ce sens secondaire, selon l'A., que le traducteur aurait eu à l'esprit lorsqu'il rendait l'hébreu *mārūtāh* par θυμώθητι, « sois courroucée ». En dehors du fait qu'un tel raisonnement est difficile à suivre, il fallait bien, pour que s'impose au traducteur ce sens secondaire de l'équivalent araméen, que le traducteur ait compris le terme hébraïque ! Et s'il l'a compris et qu'il ne l'a pas traduit selon son sens premier, c'est peut-être parce qu'il a préféré modifier l'ensemble de la phrase. D'ailleurs, *mōrātāh* est bien rendu un verset plus loin: ὅπως γένη εἰς στίλβωσιν, ἐτοίμη εἰς παράλυσιν, « de manière à ce que tu deviennes brillante, prête au relâchement ». Inutile de supposer que le traducteur soit passé par une signification secondaire, qui plus est elle n'est connue

que dans la langue tardive, alors qu'il comprenait parfaitement le sens du terme hébraïque. L'idée de courroux qu'exprime le mot grec synthétise l'idée même de toute cette métaphore du châtiment divin par l'épée.

Un long développement (p. 129-132) fait dépendre la traduction de la Septante, τὸν οἶκον τὸν περίπτερον, « la maison entourée de colonnade », de Am 3,15, non directement du groupe de mots hébraïques *bēyt-hahhōref*, « le pavillon d'hiver », mais en passant par l'équivalent araméen de *hōref*, qui est *sitwā'*, « l'hiver », lequel aurait ensuite été compris, selon l'A., non pas comme le terme pour désigner la saison, mais comme étant la transcription (fautive) en araméen (*sātōā'*, au lieu de l'attendu *'istwā'*) du grec στοά « portique » (sans le *'alef* prosthétique ni le *teth* habituels), pour aboutir à l'idée de périptère. Si la démonstration était juste, cela impliquerait que le traducteur raisonnait non pas en langue araméenne ou qu'il ne dépendait pas d'une tradition orale en langue araméenne, mais qu'il consultait une version écrite en araméen. Mais une question surgit alors: traduisait-il finalement l'hébreu ou bien élaborait-il sa version à partir d'un texte araméen ? Car aucune difficulté dans le texte hébraïque à cet endroit précis ne justifiait que l'on se reporte à une version plus accessible et que l'on préfère une lecture secondaire au texte original, parfaitement limpide.

La discussion autour de Ps 73 [72],6 (p. 27), où la traduction du dénominatif *'ānaq*, au sens concret de « mettre le collier », par l'aoriste grec de κρατέω, au sens secondaire de « s'emparer de », « dominer », donne lieu à une série de questions ingénues. « Procède-t-elle (la traduction) d'une ignorance du sens du TM qui aurait poussé le traducteur à avoir recours à la langue plus tardive ? » s'interroge l'A., en voulant sans doute parler du texte reçu, consonantique et non du massorétique, qui verra le jour des siècles, voire un millénaire plus tard. La question étonne, d'une part parce qu'il ne devait y avoir de difficulté à comprendre un verbe dénominatif comme *'ānaq*, dont le hiph'il est traduit en Dt 15,14, par ἐφοδιάζω « pourvoir », « munir de provisions » (à partir du sens de « faire s'emparer de »). D'autre part, l'« hébreu tardif » évoqué par l'A. comme possible « ressource » pour le traducteur n'est autre que l'hébreu rabbinique (information tirée du dictionnaire établi par Marcus Jastrow, qui recueille les occurrences de divers endroits du Talmud), ce qui aggrave l'anachronisme. Heureusement, l'A. se demande, in fine, si le sens de « dominer » ne pouvait se retrouver dès l'hébreu biblique, question pertinente, à condition de la poser dès le départ comme une possibilité, du moins comme hypothèse de travail, sans commettre des paralogismes.

Parfois, le syriaque (mais pas nécessairement la Peshitta) offre des rapprochements utiles, comme pour Dt 32,11, où le pi'el hébraïque *yarahhēf*, « couvrir », « planer » (hapax au qal, *hāraf*, « tanguer », « osciller », au pi'el *dis legomenon*) est traduit dans la Septante par ἐπεδόθησεν « (les) chérissant ». Dans le texte hébraïque de Dt 32, 11, l'action d'un aigle protecteur de sa nichée se laisse décomposer en cinq mouvements : il surveille (*yā'ir*), il plane au-dessus (*yarahhēf*), il déploie ses ailes (*yifrōš*), il les [les aiglons] saisit (*yiqqāhēhū*) et les hisse (*yīššā'ēhū*). La traduction grecque de ce verset suit assez fidèlement son modèle: σκεπάσαι « qui voudrait mettre à l'abri », ἐπεδόθησεν

« (les) chérissant », διείς « déployant (ses ailes) », ἐδέξατο « (les) saisissant », ἀνέλαβεν « il (les) hisse ». A. suggère le truchement du syriaque, mais, en dehors du fait qu'on ne peut invoquer le syriaque même, ce ne serait pas le verbe *raḥḥef* – qui signifie « planer », « se mouvoir avec douceur » – qui serait le plus proche, mais des dérivés comme *rūhofō*’, *clementia* ou *misericordia* (qui traduit parfois le grec οἰκτιρμός) ou *mārahfonō*’ qui peut être le *clemens* ou le *misericors*. Cela paraît à un premier abord tentant, mais ne résiste pas à une analyse approfondie, puisque le sens de « clémence » ou de « miséricorde » dont témoigne sans conteste *mārahfonō*’ est secondaire à celui d’*incubatio*, et empreint d’une exégèse biblique qui fait de l’esprit divin qui « plane » au-dessus des eaux primordiales ou les « couve », dans le récit de la Genèse, l’esprit miséricordieux. Il ne s’agit pas d’une signification intrinsèque à une strate de l’araméen, qui aurait été contemporaine des traducteurs de la Septante, mais d’un sens qui s’est superposé dans le temps à celui, premier, d’*incubatio*, par la fréquentation de l’exégèse biblique.

Souvent, l’A. a dû faire le choix d’une présentation succincte du contexte des versets discutés, ou celui des ellipses, laissant ainsi à la curiosité d’un lecteur avide de « preuves » le soin de vérifier certaines des affirmations. Si la virtuosité de l’A., qui manie avec aisance les versions, éblouit généralement le lecteur, ses démonstrations peinent parfois à s’imposer, par un trop grand empressement à vouloir imposer partout la clé araméenne ou aramaïsante, ou suggérer une distorsion occasionnée par une homophonie. C’est notamment le cas – sans vouloir multiplier les exemples – de l’interprétation de Na 2,4 (p. 33). La version grecque de la Septante s’éloigne sensiblement de son modèle hébraïque, que le traducteur rend de façon plus suggestive que littérale. Selon l’A., le traducteur se serait mépris sur la lecture du participe pu’al *mātullā’ im* « teints de rouge carmin » (de *tōlā’*, le « ver » qui produit le pigment rouge-cochenille), qu’il aurait lu comme un pluriel de *mitla’ ab* (racine *l’b*) « se moquant », « se jouant de », sans toutefois esquisser une explication technique d’une telle substitution. Peut-on suggérer une confusion dans la forme des lettres de l’époque ? Le traducteur se serait-il trompé, en lisant une lettre de plus (le b) ? Ou bien a-t-il délibérément cherché à rétablir un mot, en supposant que dans son modèle hébraïque celui-ci aurait subi une déperdition ? Dans un contexte remanié comme celui-ci, où la traduction des versets 3 et 4 perd de sa littéralité, il est difficile de proposer une lecture en ayant recours à un remaniement.

En évoquant « le traducteur grec » et sans prévenir un lecteur moins averti, qui pourrait avoir tendance à penser que la traduction de la Septante est homogène et d’une seule main, l’A. semble s’étonner qu’un même terme puisse être compris par le prisme aramaïsant en un endroit, puis, ailleurs, sans recourir à la même signification araméenne. Ce qui peut alors apparaître comme une inconséquence, est en réalité dû à l’écart qui sépare des traducteurs différents, à d’époques différentes. Ainsi s’explique le fait que, en Is 53,10, le verbe *dākā’*, signifiant « broyer » en hébreu, a pu être confondu avec son homonyme araméen, dont le sens est celui de « purifier » et être traduit par καθαρίζω, tandis qu’en Job 6,9, le même verbe *dākā’* était traduit de façon

plus appropriée par τιτρώσκω, « blesser » (p. 34-35), tout comme dans d'autres endroits d'Isaïe même, ce que d'ailleurs l'A. fait elle-même remarquer (p. 36).

L'A. s'étonne (p. 52) de l'apparente inadéquation, en Jon 4,8, entre l'hébreu *wayyit 'allāf wayyiš 'al 'et-nafšō lāmūt*, « et il se pâmât et demanda que son âme meure » (plutôt que : « il demanda à son âme de mourir », de l'A.), et le grec de la Septante καὶ ὀλιγοψύχισεν καὶ ἀπελέγετο τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ « et il perdit courage et rejeta son âme » (notre traduction). L'A. invoque avec raison le parallèle d'Élie dans le désert (1R 19,4), où la même expression hébraïque, *wayyiš 'al 'et-nafšō lāmūt*, est cette fois traduite dans la Septante différemment et littéralement par καὶ ἠτήσατο τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἀποθανεῖν « et il demanda que son âme meure ». En revanche, on ne peut adhérer à la suggestion de l'A. de voir dans la traduction grecque de Jon 4,8 une impropre « influence du syriaque » *'ešta 'ēl men* « (se) rétracter de », « s'abstenir de ». D'une part parce qu'il n'y a pas à proprement parler de syriaque à l'époque de la traduction. D'autre part, l'A. a l'esprit trop complexe pour admettre ce raisonnement simple : « rejeter son âme » revient à « demander que son âme meure ». Le traducteur n'a donc pas « laissé tomber le "pour mourir" », pour reprendre les termes mêmes de l'A.

Parmi de nombreux exemples très intéressants et des remarques judicieuses, on peut relever quelques incongruités. L'A. invoque (p. 187) « l'état de liberté textuelle reflétée » par des documents trouvés à Qumran, en voulant sans doute parler d'une relative instabilité textuelle. Moins heureuse, même s'il s'agit de reprendre une formulation de Sh. Talmon, est la référence à des « codices conservés dans le Temple » à l'époque de Qumran (p. 187), alors que la forme du codex, se substituant peu à peu au rouleau, n'a été adoptée dans les communautés juives de Palestine, d'Égypte ou d'ailleurs qu'à partir du VIII^e siècle de notre ère, longtemps après sa diffusion dans le monde païen ou les milieux chrétiens, entre les II^e-IV^e siècles ap. J.-C. (le plus ancien codex sur parchemin contenant la Bible hébraïque est le Codex Aleppensis).

Mis à part ces quelques imprécisions ou la difficulté qu'il y a à toujours suivre le raisonnement de l'A., le livre marque une avancée décisive dans la question du rôle qu'a joué l'araméen dans les choix des traducteurs grecs. Il reste encore à définir une question de fond : les traducteurs ont-ils réellement utilisé de listes d'équivalences hébreu-araméen, de « proto-targumim », comme le propose l'auteur – listes ou proto-targumim dont nous n'avons le moindre indice –, ou bien raisonnaient-ils en araméen, s'agissant finalement de la langue commune. On peut être reconnaissant à l'A. d'avoir affronté une question aussi vaste que profonde, en dépouillant avec patience et érudition des pans d'un corpus inépuisable.

MARIA GOREA

Université Paris VIII

mgorea@me.com

Naissance de la Bible grecque. Pseudo-Aristée, Lettre d'Aristée à Philocrate, suivi de: Épiphanes de Salamine, Traité des poids et mesures, et de témoignages antiques et médiévaux. Textes introduits, traduits et annotés par LAURENCE VIANÈS, collection La Roue à livres, Paris, Les Belles Lettres, 2017. Pp. LVI + 296; ISBN 978-2-251-44697-4.

L. Vianès, à qui l'on doit notamment le volume 23.12 de « La Bible d'Alexandrie » consacré à Malachie, présente et réunit ici en français les témoignages anciens sur l'origine de la Bible des Septante : Lettre du Pseudo-Aristée, Traité des poids et mesures d'Épiphanes de Salamine, mais aussi plus de 80 passages traduits du grec, du latin et de plusieurs langues sémitiques.

L'introduction (p. XI-LV) offre une synthèse à la fois critique et accessible, fondée sur une bibliographie nourrie et très à jour (rassemblée p. 267-276), sur les textes et bon nombre de questions historiographiques très délicates. Tout en étant prudente dans ses conclusions – « Il n'existe donc pas, écrit-elle p. XXI, de consensus à l'heure actuelle sur les origines de la Septante » –, l'auteure fournit un point de vue aussi pertinent que personnel, décrivant, par exemple, la Lettre du Pseudo-Aristée comme un guide touristique (p. XVI) ou comme un « excellent roman historique » (p. XIX), et relevant aussi ce que le texte ne dit pas : « Le repos du shabbat est le grand oublié (...). La traduction en grec du texte hébreu (...) qui motive tout l'ouvrage, est relatée en une seule phrase (...). Rien n'est dit du sort des rouleaux hébreux qu'ils avaient apportés » (p. XVII-XVIII).

La traduction, éclairée par une très bonne annotation (p. 217-265), a l'immense et double mérite de rafraîchir celles qui existaient déjà et d'être souvent la première qui soit faite en français. Le début de la Lettre du Pseudo-Aristée (p. 3) le montre bien si on le compare à la traduction d'A. Pelletier (Sources Chrétiennes 89, 1962) :

Ἀξιολόγου διηγήσεως, ὃ Φιλόκρατες, περὶ τῆς γενηθείσης ἡμῖν ἐντυχίας πρὸς Ἐλεάζαρον τὸν τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἀρχιερέα συνεσταμένης, διὰ τὸ σὲ περὶ πολλοῦ πεποιῆσθαι παρ' ἑκάστα ὑπομιμνήσκοντος συνακοῦσαι περὶ ὧν ἀπεστάλημεν καὶ διὰ τί, πεπεῖραμαι σαφῶς ἐκθέσθαι σοι, κατελιφῶς ἦν ἔχεις φιλομαθῇ διάθεσιν, ὅπερ μέγιστόν ἐστιν ἀνθρώπῳ, προσμανθάνειν αἰεὶ τι καὶ προσλαμβάνειν

Étant donné, Philocrate, tout l'intérêt que présente la relation de notre ambassade auprès d'Éléazar, le grand prêtre des Juifs, comme tu attaches beaucoup de prix à entendre rappeler dans le détail l'occasion et l'objet de notre mission, j'ai tâché de te faire un exposé clair, car je connais bien ta curiosité d'esprit. Justement, c'est là l'essentiel pour l'homme : toujours apprendre et s'enrichir (A. Pelletier, p. 101-103)

C'est un récit bien digne d'intérêt, Philocrate, que celui de notre rencontre avec Éléazar le grand-prêtre des Juifs. Puisqu'il t'intéresse de m'entendre rappeler en détail le sujet de notre mission et son motif, j'ai tenté de te les exposer avec

précision, connaissant ta curiosité d'esprit. Voilà bien le plus noble projet pour un homme, apprendre et s'instruire toujours davantage (L. Vianès, p. 3)

Sans parler du style, bien plus lisible, L. Vianès change opportunément « ambassade » en « rencontre » (pour ἐντυχίας) et fait droit au préverbe προσ- dans la citation de manière plus heureuse.

Quant au « traité sur les annotations philologiques de la Bible » (p. XL) qu'est en réalité le Traité des poids et mesures d'Épiphrane, il est traduit ici d'après ce qu'il en reste en grec. Voici quelques remarques relevées, avec référence aux lignes de l'édition d'E. Moutsoulas, à l'examen des §4 (dont le début est légitimement placé au milieu d'un paragraphe) à 6 (p. 57-59), sur la description de l'Ancien Testament en 4 pentateuques et sur certains ajouts faits par les « Septante-deux » : l. 112, βασιλειῶν serait à traduire comme p. 77 par « Règnes » plutôt que par « Rois » ; l. 125, « toi qui t'intéresses aux belles choses » (ὃ φιλόκαλε) gagnerait malgré la mise en contexte à s'aligner sur la traduction de φιλοκαλώτατε (« ami du beau », l. 227), de même que celle de χῶλὸν (« tronqué », l. 165) sur celle d'ἄχῳλαντον (« bancal », l. 166, le mot « boiteux » pouvant aussi bien convenir). L'attention justement portée à la récurrence de mots de la famille de πληρόω (l. 114-115, 117), significative du dessein d'Épiphrane de montrer que les livres sont « au complet », et la traduction de λογιζόμεναι (« comptés », l. 116), inviteraient, quitte à gloser, à corriger la traduction de οὕτω γὰρ λογισάμενοι τὴν περὶ τούτου πᾶσαν ὑπόθεσιν ἀνεπλήρωσαν, l. 138-139 (« C'est sur ce raisonnement qu'ils ont établi cette organisation générale du livre ») en : « Ainsi comptés, ils (les psaumes) ont complètement rempli le sujet de ce (livre, c'est-à-dire du Psautier) » ; rappelons, même s'il n'est pas sûr qu'Épiphrane entende bien ici ὑπόθεσις au sens littéraire, qu'il existe, sous le nom d'Eusèbe de Césarée, une ὑπόθεσις et des ὑποθέσεις des Psaumes (PG 23, 66-70). La formule, non attestée ailleurs, associant le verbe ἐπίσταμαι à ἀπὸ τοῦ βραχυτάτου λόγου suivi d'un groupe nominal au datif (l. 169-170, mais déjà aussi l. 52-53), est rendue de manière pénétrante et convaincante par « inférer de ce très bref morceau » ou « de cette brève indication » un cas à généraliser. Parmi les omissions les moins négligeables, enfin, signalons παρ' Ἑβραίοις (l. 118) et εἴκοσι δύο καὶ (l. 147).

Les 81 témoignages rassemblés ensuite sont classés par langue ; ils sont introduits, généralement traduits (en collaboration dans certains cas) et systématiquement accompagnés d'une très judicieuse analyse touchant à 12 questions énumérées p. 86 (« 1. Quel roi a commandé la traduction ? 2. À qui a été confiée l'exécution », etc.) ; l'index, p. 277-282, aide d'ailleurs également à mieux comparer les textes. Il faut saluer, là encore, beaucoup de traductions qui sont pionnières, ainsi que l'amplitude de la « moisson », qui va au-delà des précédentes entreprises, jusqu'à certains témoignages musulmans. Lorsqu'on lit dans un texte écrit en arabe par un chrétien et transmis dans un manuscrit de 1528 (n° 80, p. 215), « Dieu a fait descendre [la Torah sur Moïse] en langue syriaque, le Targum, et les Septante l'ont traduite en hébreu dans la langue de son peuple », on ne peut s'empêcher d'admirer l'audace de ces lointains continuateurs

du « roman historique » de la Septante. Mais la pluralité et la valeur des témoignages, notamment juifs (mais aussi byzantins, comme les deux poèmes sur les Psaumes, p. 137-141), dépassent la simple anecdote et illustrent de manière désormais irremplaçable la diversité de la réception de la Septante à travers les siècles et les communautés.

Le lecteur des Sources Chrétiennes, trouvera, de plus, de belles alternatives aux traductions connues. Quelques remarques de détail peuvent être faites sur certaines. Dans l'Adverses Haereses d'Irénée (n° 5, p. 97-98), τοῖς πάντων ἀνθρώπων συγγράμμασιν ὅσα γε σπουδαῖα ὑπῆρχεν (en latin *omnium hominum dignis conscriptionibus*), traduit par « toutes les œuvres qui comptent dans l'humanité » est mieux rendu par A. Rousseau (SC 212) : « des meilleurs écrits de tous les hommes ». Dans les Canons sur la Pâque d'Anatolios de Laodicée cités par Eusèbe de Césarée (n° 7, p. 100-101), les mots τὰ ζητούμενα... ἐπιλύοντες traduits par « en dissertant sur les points difficiles » semblent plus exactement rendus par G. Bardy (« lorsqu'ils résolvent les questions », SC 41, p. 226), mais τὰ διαδοτήρια est plus fidèlement traduit ici par « Passage » que par « Pâque » chez G. Bardy. La traduction d'un extrait de la 1^{re} homélie Contre les juifs de Jean Chrysostome (n° 12, p. 109) est quant à elle un peu loin du texte, qui tarde malheureusement à paraître aux Sources Chrétiennes. Celle, enfin, des §2 et 3 de la Préface du Pentateuque par Jérôme (faite sur PL 28 plutôt que sur une édition moderne de la Vulgate : le texte, de fait, semble identique), annonce opportunément un volume aujourd'hui paru (SC 592, 2017, p. 305-311), qui permet de la mettre en perspective ; par ex., au § 2, quae proprium σύνταγμα desiderant, là où on lit, p. 305-307 de SC 592, « qui font désirer un livre qui leur soit propre », on lit ici, p. 162, « auxquelles toute référence biblique fait défaut » : cette dernière traduction de σύνταγμα ne peut que piquer la curiosité du lecteur et aurait peut-être appelé une note explicative.

Ces quelques remarques, infimes, ne font que confirmer, a contrario, la valeur inestimable de l'ensemble de cet ouvrage. Celui-ci, réalisant et dépassant même ce qu'on pouvait en attendre dans un format somme toute réduit, informera, accompagnera et stimulera désormais sans nul doute tout lecteur de la Bible grecque.

GUILLAUME BADY

CNRS, HiSoMA–Institut des Sources Chrétiennes

Université de Lyon

69002 Lyon, France

guillaume.bady@mom.fr